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THE COURT: At this time the Court calls State of Wisconsin vs. Steven Avery. It's Case No. 05 CF 381. We're in court this morning to deal with a number of motions that have been filed -- or this afternoon. Will the parties state their appearances for the record, please.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: State of Wisconsin appears by Calumet County District Attorney Ken Kratz. I appear as Special Prosecutor and lead counsel on the case.

Seated with me is Norm Gahn, G-a-h-n, Assistant District Attorney from Milwaukee County. Mr. Gahn has been appointed by this Court, also, as Special Prosecutor. The record should further reflect that Jeff Froehlich, Assistant District Attorney from Calumet County, also is present in the courtroom.

ATTORNEY BUTING: Good afternoon, your Honor, this is Attorney Jerome Buting of Buting and Williams appearing with Mr. Avery. I'm co-counsel.

ATTORNEY STRANG: And good afternoon, as well. Steve Avery is here to the far right at the table, Dean Strang of Hurley, Burish, Stanton on his behalf as well.

THE COURT: Very well. I will indicate for the record that I met with counsel briefly in chambers before beginning today. The first order of business that we are going to take up is the defendant's motion for an order limiting public disclosure. And I will also indicate for the record that I had a brief telephone conference with counsel about this motion a week or so ago.

I indicated at that time that $I$ believed, that under Supreme Court Rule 20:3.6, that it's the Court's understanding that further trial publicity, in the form of press releases or other conversations with the press by counsel, would be extremely limited by that rule. And I encouraged the attorneys to meet with each other and try and work out an agreement for any press contacts that they felt were necessary before the Court would take up the issue as a contested matter.

But I can indicate for the benefit of everyone, that under that rule, the circumstances in which counsel for either party are permitted to communicate with the press during the course of legal proceedings are quite limited. And the Court expects, and I have received assurances
from attorneys from both sides, that they are fully aware of the rule and intend to comply with it.

There are some exceptions in the rule that apply, including discussion regarding information contained in public records. And it's my understanding, from speaking with the attorneys, that that's the matter they are intending to meet with each other about to reach an agreement. Counsel, I will give each of you a chance to comment on the record to confirm that fact.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Judge, I do confirm that we have discussed this matter. Mr. Strang and I are, I think, very close in our positions regarding Rule 3.6 and public dissemination of information. I'm quite confident that should there be any need for any additional information, or should there need to be an agreement reached on filing of public information, that that can be accomplished between Mr. Strang and myself.

THE COURT: Mr. Strang.
ATTORNEY STRANG: I think now that the Court has reiterated the requirements of Supreme Court Rule 20:3.6 and both counsel have acknowledged
those, that the Court, at the moment, need take no further action on that motion. I would add that, it's my recollection and understanding, in the course of an off the record conversation, that the State agreed, that for purposes of this motion and the agreement such as it is that we have reached, that the Calumet County Sheriff, other agents of the state or of the Sheriff's Department, would be embraced within the scope of our agreement.

Like Mr. Kratz, I also think that, with a little bit of further talking, we ought not have difficulty reaching some understanding on future filings, or invited response for that matter, which is something that I understand Mr. Kratz also thinks worthy of discussion, and I'm happy to do that.

THE COURT: Mr. Kratz, is that correct?
ATTORNEY KRATZ: That is, Judge.
THE COURT: All right. The Court, for the time being at least, will hold that motion in abeyance, with the consent of the parties and, hopefully, you will be able to come to an agreement that will resolve that matter.

The next motion has to do with the State's motion to amend the Complaint and the

Information in this case and the filing in opposition of that motion from the defense. I have received both the State's request to amend and a memorandum in opposition from the defense. Before I get to you, Mr. Strang, I guess technically it's Mr. Kratz's motion to amend.

ATTORNEY STRANG: And I wondered if I might have a moment's indulgence, since we're being broadcast as I understand and may be streamed, or whatever the word is, on the web. I wonder if the Court, perhaps, ought not address media rules here, particularly intrusion into counsel table on either side, filming during recesses, that sort of thing, before we move forward.

THE COURT: Right. It was brought to my attention, and normally we have been dealing with the media matters through the media coordinator and representatives of the television broadcast stations, and there are a few things that counsel asked me to bring up, which I will later.

The one that should be brought up immediately is that the papers that are on the desk of either counsel often contain privileged information. So I'm going to ask the cameras who are present in the courtroom, or the --
specifically, the video camera, not to zoom in on papers on table which may be confidential. Is that what you are looking for today, Mr. Strang?

ATTORNEY STRANG: That and the recess issue, but the Court can deal with that at a time of its choice.

THE COURT: Mr. Kratz, I will hear from you then, first, on your request to amend the Complaint.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Thank you, Judge. As the Court knows, the State has filed a motion to both amend the Criminal Complaint and the Criminal Information, which is the formal charging document in felony prosecutions. The State has cited two separate cases authorizing, alternatively, the filing of the Amended Complaint, and also the requirement, or lack of requirement, for an additional preliminary hearing upon the filing of new charges.

The State reiterates that these new offenses charging Mr. Avery with three separate counts -- including first-degree sexual assault, false imprisonment, and kidnapping -- are not wholly unrelated to the original series of charges.

I understand Mr. Strang has filed with
the Court a motion challenging, not the timing of the filings, but the sufficiency of the information contained in the Complaint. And with approval of the Court, I will address those issues at this time, unless the Court wants me to wait until Mr. Strang makes his argument. I have received his written argument and I'm prepared to address the sufficiency of the Complaint argument at this time, if the court would prefer I do that.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Strang, as we discussed in chambers, it's my understanding the defense is not challenging the State's right to file, at this time, an Amended Complaint and Information, but rather the sufficiency of the Amended Complaint and Information that's been proposed; is that correct?

ATTORNEY STRANG: That's the bottom line on that point. The State, of course, needs leave of the Court to file an Amended Complaint, or for that matter, an Amended Information. Leave would be withheld if the timing, or some other aspect of the filing, were prejudicial to the defense, in and of itself, and it's not. That's not my concern. It's really the reliability, or the sufficiency of the

Complaint, with which I am concerned.
THE COURT: All right. I'm not sure which one of you wishes to be heard first. Mr. Kratz is proposing the amendment, and I'm sure he feels that the Amended Complaint with the language included is sufficient, but, Mr. Kratz, I will -- since it's your motion, I'm going to let you start and briefly summarize for the Court why you feel it is, and then I will hear from Mr. Strang.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Thank you, Judge. Your Honor, as this Court knows, any Complaint needs to present probable cause, or proof to the level of probable cause which requires a Court to look at the facts contained within the four corners of the Complaint, together with any reasonable inferences that may be drawn therefrom.

Mr. Strang has complained about the sufficiency of the information in the Complaint. I might -- I might add that Mr. Strang, in his written motion and -- excuse me -- in his written pleadings, as well as other information, contains a great deal of criticism of the State for providing too much information within the four corners of this Amended Complaint.

But this Court understands that
reliability of information within the four corners of the Complaint is something that the Court must find. And so the State, in providing the detail that it did, argues that that was necessary, absolutely required, for this Court to make that finding of reliability.

Mr. Strang also argues that there are no claims of physical evidence or other corroboration in the Amended Complaint. The State obviously disagrees. There is a lengthy list of physical evidence that has been recovered, that was seized, and in fact analyzed in this case, which is all recited in the Amended Complaint.

I'm not going to go item by item, but the statements of now co-actor, Brendan Dassey, in his recounting the behavior of himself and of Mr. Avery that ultimately led to the death of Teresa Halbach, as well as the other criminal behavior, is quite detailed indeed. The State does argue, Judge, that within those details, and as I have mentioned, those details are corroborated by physical evidence which is recited for the Court within the four corners of the Complaint.

Finally, Mr. Strang argues that if Dassey's statement alone was the basis for this particular prosecution, that at trial, it could not stand besides the Lilly as well as the Crawford case. And the State concedes that, at trial, if the State intended to convict Mr. Avery on Mr. Dassey's statements alone, without any physical evidence, that they may be unable to do so. Or if we attempted to introduce a co-actor's statement, without an opportunity to cross-examine, that would also be problematical, require an advanced ruling.

But those are trial issues, Judge. Those are issues that apply to Sixth Amendment Confrontation and are unique to trial. I think Mr. Strang, at page 9 of his brief, concedes that, that although those rules appear to the trial and not to an analysis under the Criminal Complaint, Mr. Strang invites this Court to, nonetheless, throw out the Complaint, just in case, I guess, just in case the State intended to only provide that statement. Well, the State does not intend to provide only that evidence at trial. But, again, these are trial arguments, it has nothing to do with the Criminal Complaint.

When this Court reviews the four corners of the Criminal Complaint, it will find probable cause that the defendant committed each of the violations as set forth. And as I have cited in the Burke case, $B-u-r-k-e, ~ a n ~ a d d i t i o n a l ~$ preliminary hearing is not required, based upon the connection, or nexus, of the six criminal behaviors that our alleged, that is, that they are not wholly unrelated. We will ask the Court grant leave to file the Amended Complaint and Information. Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Strang.
ATTORNEY STRANG: The proposed Amended Complaint founder is not, of course, on a posit of detail here but rather on the unreliability of the detail that is included. Let me -- let me walk sequentially here through the problem that confronts the Court.

There was an original Complaint, of course, that started this criminal case back in November. It charged three crimes: First-degree intentional homicide, mutilation of a corpse, felon in possession of a firearm. The time to challenge that Complaint, or probable cause showing, is gone.

We don't -- It's established for purposes of this motion and today's proceedings. I raise it because, now, in it's proposed Amended Complaint, that the State has incorporated by reference -- as lawyers are fond of saying -- the factual allegations in the original Complaint. So, let's start there.

No one, no one presumably at the table to my left, would contend that the original Complaint, without the March 2 or whenever it was additions, made out probable cause to believe that Steve Avery committed first-degree sexual assault.

No one, I assume, in the courtroom, would contend that the original Complaint's factual basis made out probable cause, or anything close to it, on kidnapping or false imprisonment, which are the other two new counts in the proposed Amended Complaint.

So the incorporation of the factual basis in the first Complaint, while I acknowledge it, really adds nothing at all to our problem here today, focusing maybe most usefully on the first-degree sexual assault allegation that the State wishes to toss into the mix of this case now.

What is new in the proposed Amended Complaint, as counsel acknowledges, is a statement that Brendan Dassey gave, evidently, to law enforcement officers in response to law enforcement questioning, out of Steve Avery's presence, and that now the State would -- would like to use as a reliable basis for a finding that he probably committed first-degree sexual assault, and kidnapping, false imprisonment. Again, it's not -- it's not a lack of detail, there's a great deal of ugly detail that the police say Mr. Dassey provided here. It's the reliability as to Steve Avery that's the problem. I'm delighted to hear counsel acknowledge, in a fashion here today, that the Dassey statement would be inadmissible, not allowed, at trial, against Mr. Avery, absent a chance to cross-examine Mr . Dassey in that witness chair, or some similar chair. Not admissible evidence against him.

I also acknowledge that a Complaint can include the inadmissible. The Court can look at that within the four corners of the Complaint. But as Knudson and a variety of other Wisconsin
decisions, at least back to 1968 with State ex rel. Evanow against Seraphim, and I'm sure decisions before that, before $I$ was born, as the Court knows, hearsay or not, the factual assertions in a Complaint have to be reliable.

The State here, in the Complaint, alleges that these are presumptively reliable, presumed truthful and reliable, $I$ think is the exact wording of the Complaint. In fact, of course, the presumption is just the opposite. It's just the opposite as a matter of law. The U.S. Supreme Court has made that clear at least by Bruton back in 1968, while we're on 1968 cases, Lee, Williamson, Lilly.

This is sort of beyond repetition at this point. This is really very clearly established, that when an accomplice or someone claims he is an accomplice, is questioned by the police and says, yeah, I was involved, you know, but he was -- he was involved too, he did this and that, and points to someone else, that's unreliable stuff.

It's blame shifting. It's literally finger pointing. And it's a very effective way for an accomplice, caught cold or not, to sound
credible by acknowledging some involvement, but to lay off blame, in part, or in large part, on another person. Are the risks of that particularly high when we're talking about a 16 year old boy who may be slow and being questioned by two police officers, presumably without a parent or a lawyer around? Yes, the risks of that are particularly high, if we get into specifics on reliability.

But the Court's, including the Wisconsin Court of Appeals in Myren, which Mr. Buting and I have cited, has been very clear that this stuff is inherently suspect, inherently unreliable, presumptively unreliable, just to quote bits and pieces. So the State really can't claim the presumption that the amendment tenders.

Neither does the Complaint offer anything more than a presumption that Brendan Dassey's statements are truthful and reliable, not as to Brendan Dassey, but as to Steve Avery. And that's where the problem is. They simply are not, as a matter of law, reliable as to Steven Avery; hence, the motion asking the Court, not to strike the original three charges, of course, but to deny the State leave here to file the three
new charges.
Timing is not prejudicial, that's not the issue, as we have agreed. The reliability, or rather the unreliability of the entire factual basis here, there being as to first-degree sexual assault, kidnapping, and false imprisonment, nothing but an inadmissible, unreliable statement by Brendan Dassey to support this Complaint.

Allowing it to be filed would require the Court only later, when $I$ filed a motion challenging probable cause, to dismiss those three counts. Again, there's no reason to do that. The Court, on the grounds we have articulated, ought deny leave to file this proposed Amended Complaint, at least as to the three new charges. That ruling would necessarily moot inquiry into what is procedurally a subsequent document in Wisconsin criminal courts, which is an Amended Information.

We also don't have to get to the question of a preliminary examination, if the Court denies leave to file the Amended Complaint, because there's nothing on which to have a preliminary examination at that point.

I could pause and let the Court say
something, but I will note that I very much disagree were this Amended Complaint to be filed with leave of the Court and then to withstand a motion to dismiss on probable cause grounds; I very much disagree that a preliminary examination would be unnecessary, legally, as to those three counts.

And I can get into Burke, and more illuminating, Bailey, a decision that Burke extends, or at least endorses. It's the facts of both of those cases, suggest why, although their new counts were not wholly unrelated to the evidence adduced at the preliminary examination here, these new counts would be wholly unrelated, at least the first-degree sexual assault, and the kidnapping. May not need to get there, so I will yield the microphone.

THE COURT: Mr. Kratz, anything in rebuttal?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Just a couple of things, briefly, Judge. Once again, if Mr. Strang and the defense is allowed to extend these trial confrontation principles to the Criminal Complaint analysis, State argues that you would never, or at least would be very difficult to ever charge
co-defendants, at least when one of the defendants makes a statement and the other does not.

Again, they simply are not Complaint principles, these are trial confrontation principles. Let me also talk, then, to the reliability question that Mr. Strang raises. Reliability of statements of a co-declarant in Lilly and in other cases cited by Mr. Strang, don't just inculpate the co-defendant, don't just point the finger at somebody else, but they are also meant to exonerate the declarant.

That's not what we have here. Mr. Dassey's statement in no respect, at least as cited in the Amended Complaint, intended to exonerate Mr. Dassey at all. Mr. Dassey inculpates himself. He says I acted together with my uncle, Steven, without threat, without reprisal, knowingly and voluntarily engaging in the same kinds of behaviors.

So when a defendant -- when a suspect makes a statement, that against their own penal interests, they deserve reliability. And that is much distinguished from the kinds of statements, again, that were offered in Lilly and others. That's all I have got, Judge. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. First of all, there have been a number of reported decisions, especially United States Supreme Court decisions, in recent years involving the admissibility of the statements of co-defendants at trial where the State seeks to introduce the statement, not through the actual person of the co-defendant, but as hearsay testimony.

And the law in that regard has changed a good deal in recent years against the State and in favor of the defense, culminating with the Crawford case, which held, as close as you can, as a black letter rule, that if a co-defendant's testimony is going to be used against the defendant, the co-defendant in virtually all cases has to testify.

But I think it's dangerous to simply equate those cases to the situation where you are dealing with a Complaint and whether or not the statements of a co-defendant can be used as a basis for a Complaint. The closest case from Wisconsin on the facts, that $I$ could find, is a 1974 case called Ruff versus State, which dealt precisely with this issue, that is, whether or not a Complaint could be based on the statement
of a co-defendant that implicated the defendant.
I will read a little bit from that decision. The Court asked: Was the Complaint legally sufficient to establish probable cause? The defendant admits the sufficiency of the Complaint to establish probable cause that the alleged crimes had been committed, but challenges the sufficiency to establish probable cause that the defendant committed the crimes.

The part of the Complaint which names the defendant is based upon statements made to police officers by the defendant's accomplices, Charles Flowers and Willy Payne. Such statements were hearsay, but a Criminal Complaint may be based on hearsay.

The Court goes on in that case to hold that, the statements against penal interest made by a co-defendant can be used as a basis for probable cause in a Complaint where the statement is not the statement of the co-defendant essentially attempting to exculpate himself, that is, there can be cases where a co-defendant is simply trying to blame someone else.

But where the statements are interrelated, such that the co-defendant is
implicating himself at the same time he's implicating someone else, I believe the law in Wisconsin, as it applies to Criminal Complaints, remains, that such statements can be used where, when considered in context, they have sufficient indicia of reliability. And based on my review of the Complaint, I do believe that that's the case here.

I recognize that some of that rationale has been criticized in the cases that have led to testimony in those cases not being admitted where it doesn't come from the co-defendant himself at trial. But that's based primarily on confrontation clause issues under the United States Constitution. And I'm not aware of any decision that has used the same rationale to say that the statements of a co-defendant cannot be used to supply a probable cause in a Complaint. So, for that reason, I believe that the statements of Mr. Dassey contained in the proposed Amended Complaint can be used as a basis for the Complaint. And I believe that with those statements, the Complaints are sufficient as they have been filed. I believe that's the only basis on which the Amended Complaint is really being
challenged. So, the Court is going to grant the State's motion to file the Amended Complaint.

I think implicit in Mr. Strang's argument is that he may have other issues related to that matter that he wishes to argue. So, Mr. Kratz, I will direct you to prepare the order allowing you to file your Amended Complaint. And, Mr. Strang, I will give you the opportunity to file additional pleadings, if you wish, regarding whether your client is entitled to a preliminary examination, based on the Amended Complaint.

ATTORNEY STRANG: I can do that within 10 days after the order is signed, if that's sufficient for the Court.

THE COURT: All right. I will allow you to do that. At the end of today's proceedings, I can see we may have to do some scheduling. But for now, I will give you 10 days to file your motion in that respect. Let me ask this, do the parties anticipate any additional issues other than the defendant's right to a preliminary examination on the Amended Complaint, relating strictly to the Complaint and the proposed Amended Information?

ATTORNEY STRANG: We can short circuit the
one I would see which is, I will move now to dismiss the three new counts for want of probable cause, relying on the arguments I have already made. And if $I$ heard correctly, the Court ruled that, with the Dassey statements in, as a factual basis, there is probable cause. I disagree and I will make the motion, for the purpose of making it clear, that I do want those three counts dismissed once the Amended Complaint is filed.

THE COURT: All right.
ATTORNEY STRANG: But don't need to brief it separately.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything further on the Complaint issue before we move on?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: No.
THE COURT: All right. The next issue that the Court will take up is the defendant's motion to assure fair forensic testing, which involves a request by the defense to either be present when the State Crime Lab performs analysis on items that have been seized in the course of the investigation in this case, or in the alternative, to have the testing procedures videotaped. And if I understand correctly, Mr. Buting, you will be making the defense argument on this issue?

ATTORNEY BUTING: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: I will hear from you at this time.

ATTORNEY BUTING: The defense motion is somewhat unusual, but $I$ think given the nature of this case and it's unique history, I think it's appropriate, especially in light of concerns that were raised earlier, before either Mr. Strang or myself became involved in the case, about possible bias from law enforcement, that I would think the State would actually welcome efforts to make the testing process more transparent.

And that would be by allowing a defense representative to be present during any portions of the testing where they are handled -- where the evidence gets handled by the analyst or technicians and/or to videotape those portions of the testing process to ensure, or at least to limit the possibility of there being any contamination that may occur of the evidence in the lab once it gets there, either accidental or otherwise.

I believe that, although there are no cases that have specifically addressed this issue, $I$ think the Court does have authority to
do so by considering Statutes 165.79 and 971.23 together. The first allows the Court to order the Crime Lab to perform tests on the defense behalf under certain circumstances.

And if the Court has the authority to do that, then this is a lesser remedy, or request, which is simply to allow the defense to participate in observing, not to interfere with the process itself, and to necessarily then be present during the generation of the results of the tests, which are disclosable anyway under 971.23. And all this would do is move up the time when those rules get disclosed, that is, at the time that the State learns them, the defense representative would also be there and also learn them.

There are, I think, very unusual circumstances in this case that warrant that. The remedy that the State suggests in their response objecting to our motion, is independent testing. Independent testing can work in some instances and to some degree, but not if material is already contaminated.

A repeated independent test of contaminated evidence does nothing towards
getting at the truth, it simply repeats or confirms the original erroneous results. The State also suggests that, in addition to that, by the way, having independent tests done subsequent to the State's test, can also build an additional delay.

I don't know how long it's going to take for the State to complete the tests that they have not yet done. That would be, presumably, on items that were seized in the March 2 nd, I think it was, search warrant. But an independent test would necessarily have to take place after that. And that could be while Mr. Avery is at least presently incarcerated.

The bail issue, we'll be dealing with later, but if he remains incarcerated then that works to his disadvantage by requiring him to sit in jail longer, just because the State resists transparency in the process, at this point, allowing a defense view of what goes on in the Crime Lab. So independent testing is not a adequate remedy to the concerns that the defense has in this particular case.

The State also, in it's written objection, complained that somehow this would
jeopardize the accreditation of the State Crime Lab if an outside observer were allowed in. And I don't see that at all. Nothing that they cite in their written brief indicates that.

Accreditation requires that a lab comply with security and control and methods, which are not always done, by the way, despite the fact that they are supposed to be accredited. But those could also be complied with very easily with the defense expert who might be present.

I have spoken with a defense expert who has done this in other labs, in various states, including recently Illinois, I believe also Maine. It's done very easily. He is clothed in surgical type scrubs, mask, same way that the State analyst should or would be.

He is also -- has no objection to the State's concern that -- that the Crime Lab has a process whereby their staff provides their own DNA genotype, so that in the event results should come up, or would come up, that would show that there's some other DNA in it, if it turns out to be the analyst's, then it could be discarded as evidence -- as indication of contamination. The defense expert would also be willing to do that.

So, I don't see anything about the way that the Crime Lab is set up in it's testing that would prohibit, or make it somehow a threat or jeopardy to their accreditation to allow a defense representative to be present simply observing what's going on. The State also cites in their written opposition a number of older cases where the Courts did rule that it was not -- or they denied defense motions to do similar types of observations.

But one reason that this motion is brought in this case is because of what we have learned, what the public has learned, about Crime Labs all over the nation in the last five, six years. I cite to some law review articles that talk about the studies that have been done.

Now 17 states, Crime Labs in 17 different states, have been found to have either had fraudulent behavior by some of the analysts, or erroneous test results, incompetence, everything, the entire spectrum of problems that result in false tests, that, in some instances in Kansas, resulted in the correct suspect being released, going out and committing another offense. And in other instances, innocent people
being wrongly identified through DNA testing and only later, fortuitously, was it determined that the mistake was made.

The FBI lab, once considered the most prestigious, elite lab in the world, went through a horrible scandal of disclosure of, not just mistakes -- and there were many, many instances of that -- but also deliberate, fraudulent conduct resulting in one of their analysts being convicted of a misdemeanor for fraudulent reporting on DNA reports. That went on for two years before the lab discovered it.

Now, I'm sure the State will say more different, this is Wisconsin, we have a very fine lab here, it's never been proven to have fraudulently or erroneously come up with test results that have affected a case. But I am also quite sure that the prosecutors in courts and public believe that in all of those other states, in each of those cases.

And yet we now know otherwise. We now know that these kinds of mistakes do take place and there is worldwide discussion on what to do about the problems with Crime Labs. DNA evidence has considered this with programs like CSI on TV
and other things like that, considered this the ultimate proof, the pristine evidence one way or the other. But that's only true so much as the Crime Labs in this country and in this state are competent, fair, and able to produce correct results.

Therefore, what we're suggesting is, given the implications of what has gone on in this case, or what was implied anyway, earlier, before we became involved, we think that the best way to resolve, to assure that that doesn't extend further into the testing process, is to simply allow transparency.

That's all we're asking, no interference, just transparency to allow a defense representative to be present during the handling of the evidence, or in the alternative, a less favored alternative. But at a minimum, something that certainly wouldn't cause any contamination, would be to videotape at any time when the analysts are handling the evidence itself.

There's periods of time when it's sort of cooking in the incubator, and it wouldn't need to be filming that portion, but when it's taken
out, when it's moved from one step in the process to the next, that could certainly be recorded and preserved and that would, I think, lessen the likelihood of there being any implications of wrong doing or mistakes down the road. I think there is authority for it. It's in the Court's discretion to grant it and that's what we ask. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Strang, do I understand that Mr. Gahn is going to be addressing this issue? Mr. Kratz, I'm sorry.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Yes, Mr. Gahn.
THE COURT: Mr. Gahn.
ATTORNEY GAHN: Thank you, your Honor. I'm going to rely upon the brief that $I$ filed in response to their request to be present for the testing or, in the alternative, to have it videotaped and just amplify a few portions of that brief.

Again, the defense has cited no authority, or any statutory authority, or case precedent, to authorize them into the Crime Laboratory, or for videotaping of the procedures that go on in the Crime Laboratory. I must emphasize to the Court that in a Crime

Laboratory, especially with DNA testing, the issues of security and contamination are just of the utmost importance.

And they are so very important in the accreditation process of a Crime Laboratory. And any time that you lessen that security, or allow the potential to introduce other contaminants into the Crime Laboratory, that's going to place that accreditation into some jeopardy.

The State has cited three cases where that issue has come before appellate courts and they have ruled against the defense. I guess, your Honor, you have to understand what happens at the Crime Laboratory. We're talking about a huge number of items here of evidence. This is not just one item that is coming into the Crime Lab. It's just a huge number of items.

And when the Crime Lab gets these items of evidence, they are going to be screened, first of all, and that can take a couple of days. And once it's been screened, and they believe there may be something of potential value to submit to some type of DNA testing, then that's when the extraction process takes place. And that can take, also, a couple of days.

The problem is, once the extraction process is finished, the items are batched. And what happens is, other analysts may batch, with this case, items that they are testing for their cases. And then there's what's called the quantitation. And this is a very important process, which is, again, days and days later. And once they realize how much DNA is present, whether there is a certain quantity, then the analysts, again, determine which are going to be set up for the amplification process. And then you still have a number of other processes that can take two to three weeks to complete.

The intrusiveness, the burdensome nature of their request, would make it almost impossible for a Crime Lab to operate when you are looking at so many items of evidence, and the process, and how the process -- how the analysis process takes place.

The Crime Lab is accredited. They follow very strict, stringent, national standards. And one of the reasons for writing such strict national standards is that the defense is given, in their discovery process, and
it's routinely done in Wisconsin, they are given the bench notes. They are given the protocol. They are allowed to see the quality assurance guidelines as followed, the gene scan data, the genotype RE-data.

It's all designed so that an outside expert can look at the protocol, can look at the process, the analysis that was done, and determine whether it was followed, so that defense is not left without anything in this case. They are open to all the paperwork and the analytic process through the DNA typing. Having someone in and trying to video tape it, again, would be so burdensome and such an order were granted, I think the Court can appreciate, if every defendant were allowed to have an expert go in to look, or a videotaping done, you could almost shut down the Crime Laboratory.

There are so many sensitive items that are out at the Crime Lab. It's evidence from cases all over the State of Wisconsin. It's a very, very, sensitive issue and security is paramount. So I would ask the Court --

One other issue I would like to address
is the unnamed independent expert. I don't know what were the circumstances of this independent expert, or what the circumstances were to go into an Illinois Crime Lab and observe. In all candor, I will admit to the Court, I have heard of cases where that is done, or there's an agreement between the defense and the prosecution to send the item for independent testing. But those generally are cases where there is one critical piece of evidence and there will be a total consumption of that evidence.

Then you get into issues of what is materially relevant, what is potentially exculpatory evidence, and you get into an Arizona vs. Youngblood analysis. That's generally where those cases come about, where it is just one piece of evidence that could be inculpatory, or it could be exculpatory. And the defendant has no other comparable means of getting that evidence analyzed.

Under those circumstances, I have heard of where the defense and the State would get together and maybe agree on an independent lab to do it, or perhaps agree upon the -- a defense expert viewing that process. But that is the
rare case. And -- From my understanding and from the knowledge that I have.

So I would ask the Court to grant our position and that the defense not be allowed in to observe the testing, or to videotape it, mostly because of just the burdensome nature it would have upon the Crime Lab and the security issues and just the integrity of the whole Crime Lab set up. Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Buting, anything else?
ATTORNEY BUTING: Just briefly, your Honor. As to the question of burdensome, there being so many items, I seriously doubt that in this case, because from what I understand from prosecution, that most, if not all, of the items originally seized back in November in this case have been tested. So, we're really only talking about items that are seized as a result of the most recent search warrant.

And I don't think there are that many of them that were seized, and probably a very small percentage of them that, that when looked at, will have any area that would be worthwhile to test. So there may only be a handful, five, six items perhaps, that in this case will still be tested.

So I don't understand the argument that it's so burdensome, because there are so many items. There's no reason those can't all be run at the same time. That would not -- In fact, it would probably be the normal course, if there's one analyst working on this case, which I understand there would be.

Yes, through discovery, the State does provide bench notes and raw data and that sort of thing, which can be helpful to an expert, but it says nothing about the potential of contamination, cross-contamination between items of evidence. None of that can be found after the fact. That's the problem.

That's why, it's that very reason that the State, in order to become accredited, has to take all kinds of precautions to try and prevent that. But accreditation, some of these other labs, where these problems have been developed, have been accredited, and have thought that they had very good, sound protocols that were being followed and, low and behold, they discover that's not the case.

Finally, as to the question of whether
there is -- It's true that perhaps these motions are more likely granted or agreements made when there is one item of evidence that will be all used up in the course of the testing, but at this point $I$ don't know whether that's going to be the case here or not. I don't know yet.

I don't think the State knows that, that there is sufficient, or that there would be, if they find an area that would be worthy of searching for DNA, that it would be sufficient to guarantee a separate half of it, or whatever sample, for a subsequent, independent test. And I don't think they are going to know that until a number of things happen --

One, they eyeball it and look at it, whether it's cloth, or concrete, or whatever it may be. And, secondly, only after they have run it through a process to determine whether there is an amount that's quantifiable, that's enough, enough DNA present to try and test it further. So we may find ourselves in that situation where there is nothing left for the defense to test, once the State completes its.

The last point is that $I$ would ask, or I guess maybe to make clear as a matter of a Brady

Demand, orally, I can follow up with something in writing. In the event the Court does not grant this motion, $I$ do want to make it clear that we do consider raw data, notes, charts, things of that matter, and preservation of sufficient quantities of future testing to be considered Brady material that could be exculpatory, that could point to other individuals.

And that would include DNA fingerprints, all types of forensic evidence. That would also include, particularly in this case, any test results that prove positive for law enforcement DNA, which in most cases are simply discarded as erroneous mistakes, but in this case, given the history, we view as Brady material that should be preserved for subsequent review by the defense. So with that I would ask the Court to grant the motion.

THE COURT: All right. For purposes of today's hearing, I'm taking up the motion as it's been filed. I'm not going to comment on the last items that you mentioned. I'm specifically dealing with the defense request to either observe testing by the State Crime Lab or to have that testing videotaped.

The first issue I looked at was whether or not there was a due process right on the part of the defendant to observe such testing. I, actually, before $I$ got the State's response, looked at the New York case that's cited, that is New York vs. Monigas, which is a case that involved a request, I believe, precisely identical to that that was made here. And the Court in that case ruled that there was not such a due process right. I have not been able to find any case that creates a constitutional right to observe testing in cases like this. And I don't understand the defense to be arguing that there is any such authority.

I next look at the Wisconsin Statutes. We do have a statute that has been mentioned, I think by both parties, that deals with this issue; specifically, Section 165.79 (1). That reads in relevant part as follows:

Evidence, information and analyses of evidence obtained from law enforcement officers by the laboratories -- and I understand it to mean the State Crime Lab there -- is privileged and not available to persons other than law enforcement officers. Nor is the defendant
entitled to an inspection of information and evidence submitted to the laboratories by the State, or of the laboratory's findings, or to examine laboratory personnel as witnesses concerning the same, prior to trial, except to the extent that the same is used by the State at a preliminary hearing and except as provided in Section 971.23.

Upon request of a defendant in a felony action, approved by the presiding judge, the laboratories shall conduct analyses of evidence on behalf of a defendant. No prosecuting officer is entitled to an inspection of the information or evidence submitted to the laboratories by the defendant, or of the laboratory's finding, or to examine laboratory personnel as witnesses concerning the same, prior to trial, except to the extent that the same is used by the accused at a preliminary hearing and except as provided in Section 971.23.

The statute was discussed in the case of

## State of Wisconsin vs. Franszczak,

F-r-a-n-s-z-c-z-a-k, a 2002 Wisconsin Court of Appeals case. And in that case, the Court essentially says that the statute means what it
says and that is, that the State Crime Lab performs testing on behalf of the State. It's not subject to disclosure or discovery, except as provided by the statute. And, likewise, if it provides discovery on behalf of the defendant, that the State can't get at the information, except in the circumstances provided for in the statute.

I'm not going to decide today whether or not there might be some special circumstances under which the Court could grant the request made by the defense in this case. I don't see anything in the statute that expressly prohibits it, but at least the statute seems to suggest that, in the ordinary course of things, absent some extenuating circumstances at a minimum, the legislature doesn't contemplate the statute granting a request like this.

I will also note that, although there have been incidents of mistakes in other Crime Labs, and I think any time you are dealing with human beings that's always a possibility, I'm not aware that our State Crime Lab has ever been involved in this type of a thing. And as the State noted in the brief, it was actually the

State Crime Lab's tests in the defendant's prior case that resulted in him being released from prison after being wrongfully convicted. And the State fully acknowledges that fact.

So based -- For those reasons, I don't believe there's a basis here for granting the defendant's request and I'm going to deny the State's motion regarding forensic testing.

ATTORNEY GAHN: The defense motion, your Honor.

THE COURT: The defense motion for forensic testing. I'm certainly not foreclosing the parties from coming to an agreement, if they do. Anything that expedites the process and makes both parties feel assured the testing is being done properly is a benefit to all. But in the absence of that, the statute seems to contemplate, as a general rule, a different approach and, therefore, the Court is denying the defendant's motion.

The last item to deal with today is the motions that have been made by each of the parties for modification of bail in this case. The defense made its motion first, so $I$ will hear from the defense first. Will that be Mr. Strang or Mr. Buting?

ATTORNEY STRANG: Mr. Strang.
THE COURT: Mr. Strang.
ATTORNEY STRANG: We have no quarrel
with -- today with the reasonableness of the amount of bail set by the Court here, working off of the half million dollar number. Our motion goes to the surety or the security that the Court would accept, as a financial condition, to reasonably assure Mr. Avery's appearance in court, as he is required, and the safety of the community.

And what we're asking here is for the Court to allow the posting of property, the tendering of a mortgage, or can be done with a Quitclaim Deed that then is not filed by the County Clerk unless bond conditions are violated. But there are different ways to accomplish using real property as security to meet the financial aspect of the bail condition.

Mr. and Mrs. Avery, who are behind me, are willing to post all of the property they own in the world, the Manitowoc County property, the Marinette County property. We have had that appraised for fair market value. The combined, unincumbered value of those properties well exceeds the half million dollars in bail that the

Court has set.
These are solvent sureties, in other words, and the Wisconsin Statutes have absolutely no presumption against, or bias against, the use of property to secure appearance and compliance with bail conditions, as opposed to cash. Real property as opposed to cash or other personalty. The Corporation Counsel for the County of Manitowoc filed a letter of his own raising concerns. And I think that Corporation Counsel misapprehends the very purpose of posting property. The issue here is not what value the Avery Salvage Yard or a property near Crivitz might have to Manitowoc County. The issue is its fair market value and, more importantly, it's value to Steve Avery or the people he loves and care about him.

The point, of course, is not for the property to come into legal ownership of Manitowoc County. The point is that if he didn't follow conditions of bond, his parents would lose, literally, the farm. That's the level that we have to assure a defendant's compliance with conditions of release, that the Court sets. So, without wading into DNR issues or
other issues really, fundamentally, the Corporation Counsel's concerns miss the point of Chapter 969. There's no real question here that the fair market value, regardless of what Manitowoc County might pay for the property, the fair market value of the property well exceeds the half million dollars in cash.

As a practical matter, unless the Court modifies bail, he is not getting out. As a practical matter. Now, the Court knows, I know, perhaps some in the public or some in the media even have forgotten, that he's innocent. As he sits here today, he is legally presumed innocent.

I mean, we can dress him up in something that makes him look like he, you know, jumped off a Monopoly game board or something. He's a get-out-of-jail-free card come to life. But he is innocent as he sits here today.

And, you know, he had his Thanksgiving meal, as a presumptively innocent man, in the jail. He had his Christmas meal, as a presumptively innocent man, in the County Jail. He is heading toward his Easter meal, as a presumptively innocent man.

And all of this delay is necessary,
nobody is quarreling with the delay. But the earliest, as $I$ understand it, that he's going to have a full chance to be heard, and to put the State to its burden of proof here to prove what it alleges, will be after his Labor Day meal, as things stand, if he is not out.

Ten months is a long time to sit, if you are presumptively innocent. And this is someone who is sort of sensitive about sitting in custody when he's innocent, and I understand that. He's got no history of trying to evade justice, skipping court. If anything, it's justice that once evaded him.

He's lived right here in Manitowoc County all his life. Lives on the parent's property. This is -- This is not just a homestead, but it's a place on which the family's business, you know, from which it derives its entire livelihood. He is not going to put that at risk.

The reasonable perception here is he is not going to put that at risk by failing to abide conditions of release. His parents would stand to lose everything, if he did, as would he. I mean, it's his livelihood that is made on this
property as well.
The State here has relied on angry letters that he wrote to his ex-wife, who divorced him while he was in prison for a crime he didn't commit. Those were written, the most recent of them, according to Judge Hazlewood in his transcript, was 15 years ago now, in 1991. They were angry, they were aggressive.

His wife was trying to deprive him of any further contact with his young children. I guess I would be angry too, in his circumstance, particularly where I'm sitting in prison on something I didn't do, which is exactly the situation he was in at the moment.

So it's not to excuse angry, aggressive, ugly letters that he wrote 15 years, 17 years, 19 years ago. It is to put them into a context that suggests they say very, very, little today about whether he will come back to court when he's supposed to and whether he will stay in his house, as he's supposed to, other than when conditionally allowed to leave by this Court.

Once we get past letters to his ex-wife, now we're into the State offering past criminal acts that are getting near a quarter century old.

We're getting into the State offering convicts who only now are coming forward and saying, presumably, or at least tacitly suggesting, get me out of jail and $I$ will testify that this guy, you know, talked about building torture chambers, and all kinds of other stuff, that inmates didn't bother to report for the 15, or 18 years, or whatever it's been since they say they heard it from Avery.

This is all so much nonsense, honestly. Really, so much nonsense. The State has been out and searched the Avery property, with consent, probably five times or more. With search warrants, at least a couple times, maybe three, something like that. Nobody had a torture chamber. No torture chamber on the Avery property, in the trailer he lived in, or anywhere else.

So it's really, some of that is beneath further comment. But what's not is the Court's ability to fashion non-monetary, non-financial conditions as well. And Steve Avery wanted me to tell the Court, and invite the Court, to impose any other non-monetary conditions it sees as appropriate here, including increasing the
restrictiveness of the conditions of release already set, since we have moved to modify. Something your Honor might reasonably be concerned about is, if he's out of jail, are we going to be asking that he be allowed to go down to Madison to see me, or down to Brookfield to see Mr. Buting. And the answer is, no, we will come to him. He can be restricted to Manitowoc County. Electronic monitoring wouldn't be a bad idea and is fully acceptable to Steve Avery. Very controlled time out of the house or away from the property, fully acceptable to Mr. Avery. If the Court wants him to report in person to the Two Rivers' Police Department, or some other law enforcement agency, on a regular cycle, fully acceptable to Mr. Avery. And, of course, I would expect, that in the process of posting real property to secure the bail that the Court has set, that the State would want to look at the appraisals, want to look at title and any encumbrance to it. And I'm wholly prepared to share all of that information with the State. Indeed, the Avery's, the senior Avery's, have gone to the trouble of retaining Mr. Krajnek, a local lawyer here who does real
estate work, to assist in assembling the information that would be necessary to secure bail with real estate, rather than cash. So, that is -- that's our request here today. I know the State has a competing motion, but perhaps it's better in my place to respond to the State's argument in that respect.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Kratz.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: Thank you, Judge. Mr. Strang is correct, the State does have a competing motion that we filed. Actually, the other side of Mr. Strang's motion, the other side of the coin, if you will, is our second motion, that is, our motion to increase cash bail. And I'm going to take this opportunity then to first argue that, since it addresses those same factors that Mr. Strang has argued.

The State no longer believes that a $\$ 500,000$ cash bond is appropriate. The Court may recall that this State originally requested a $\$ 1,000,000$ cash bond to secure Mr. Avery's future court appearances. But this Court can, and I believe should, take into consideration new factors, that is, what we have learned since the last time we addressed bond. Court and addressed bond, substantial changes have occurred in this case. Now, Mr. Strang can sit here and presume Mr . Avery to be innocent; I don't have to do that. And when I make these arguments to the Court, the statute, 969.01 (4), is on the State's side in that regard when it invites, in fact, requires the Court consider the character and strength of the State's case.

Now, the character and strength of the case against Steven Avery, I will argue, has changed dramatically since we last visited this issue. The detailed statements given by what I'm calling the co-actor, the co-perpetrator in this case, speak directly to the nature, number, and gravity of offenses. And to leave bond at the previously issued, I believe does a disservice not only to this particular case, but does not reflect Mr. Avery's likelihood of appearing at future court appearances.

Those other factors that I previously argued, including the degree of violence used, there's new information as to those. I had already argued the prior criminal record, the fact that other crimes have been committed while

Mr. Avery was out on legal status, that he's now been bound over for trial.

New information, though, on our request to increase cash bail to $\$ 2$ million, includes the allegations of his plans to flee the jurisdiction. The alternatives to cash bail not being warranted, as cited by Manitowoc County Corp Counsel, and what I'm arguing is one of the most important factors, that is, Mr. Avery's character.

Those items contained in the affidavit -- again, an affidavit, something more than mere allegations, but something contemplated by the motion practice in the State of Wisconsin -- sets forth some specific acts of violence, some specific plans of Mr. Avery that I think are very important as to the State's request for the increase in cash bail. And, therefore, I make that request, your Honor, to raise cash bail, to deny any kind of surety or property bond and to increase the cash bail previously authorized, to $\$ 2$ million.

I am prepared, Judge, although as I mentioned, included in a formal detailed motion and affidavit, to argue the denial of bail. But

I didn't know if the Court wanted to address the first motion, or what I have characterized as the other side of Mr. Strang's motion, first. But I am prepared to proceed, your Honor.

THE COURT: With respect to the motion to deny bail, that's a request that has not been made to me before in another case. But as I read the statute, and I reread it this morning, I believe it involves a testimonial hearing, an evidentiary hearing, with fairly extensive description. It involves, essentially, a mini trial.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: It does, Judge, and that's why I have stopped. I have the witnesses. I have officers prepared for that. I don't know how much time the Court has set aside for that. Let me also indicate that, depending on how the Court and Mr. Strang wants to proceed, it may even contemplate calling other witnesses, or providing writs, or the like, for what the Court calls a mini trial.

I don't disagree with that procedure as contemplated in the statute, that's why I'm stopping at this point and, I think, asking the Court to rule on Mr. Strang and my motion. Frankly, Judge, depending on that motion, the State may ask in another manner to be heard on
the denial motion.
THE COURT: Mr. Strang, I'm looking now for your response to the motion to increase cash bail. I'm not seeking comment on the motion to deny bail.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Okay. It's -- A lot of this is so academic that one wonders why the State wants to talk about it. The original charges, the first one, carries a mandatory life sentence. And then we have got 12 and a half years of possible confinement on one charge, beyond that. And I haven't even looked recently, seven years, or five years, or something on the other one. But once you are at mandatory life, you know, adding on more exposure, really doesn't alter the calculus much for a defendant in deciding whether he's going to stick around or try to make a run for it.

In terms of his proclivities, boy, I mean, I didn't notice much in my television back in early November, any inclination of him to avoid anybody, a camera, a police officer. He's consenting to searches. He's talking to anybody who wants to search him. He's going up to the family's cottage, to be sure, a cottage they have had for decades up in Crivitz. Everybody knows where he is.

There's nothing here, not only in the lead up to this arrest, but in his earlier cases, to suggest that he tries to runaway or avoid obligations to come to court. There's just nothing. Not a bench warrant, as far as I know, at least nothing the State has tendered to the Court. So, you know, and adding -- we could add a hundred more charges here, if creative counsel wanted to do that, and it wouldn't really change the functional incentives that have been in place since this case was charged with a first-degree intentional homicide count.

Beyond that, you know, I note under our statutes, and specifically 969.08 (5), it is a little bit ambiguous here. If he were out on release and the State alleged that he violated conditions of release and wanted to tighten up or add conditions to address a violation of conditions of release once he's out, if that were the State's request, we would be entitled to a hearing. And the State would bear the burden of proof by clear and convincing evidence, in establishing both the violation and the need for some tighter conditions.

Now, it is ambiguous because one also
can read the same statute, 969.08 (1) or (5) as allowing the Court, on the State's motion, to increase conditions of bail. So, I'm not hanging my hat, so to speak, on this entirely. But it's passing strange to say that if you were out, you know, increasing cash from half a million dollars to $\$ 2$ million as a response to some violation of conditional release would entitle me to a hearing at which there is an intermediate standard of proof.

But when he is not out and has no realistic prospect of posting half a million dollars in cash, that's not happened, would have happened by now if that was anywhere within the realm of possibility, that the State, with no showing other than statements of inmates or 20 year old allegations being filtered through a law enforcement officer's affidavit now can quadruple the amount of bail that the Court is being asked to set.

THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Kratz?
ATTORNEY KRATZ: No, not on this issue, Judge. Thank you.

THE COURT: I'm going to take a brief recess. I have my notes from the prior bail hearing
in chambers. I'm going to look at them and then I'll come back.

ATTORNEY BUTING: Your Honor, could we deal with that issue of recess with regard to cameras and filming at this time, if we're going to break the proceedings?

THE COURT: Yes, for purposes of today's hearing, I'm going to ask the camera folks to shutdown during the recess. The court proceedings aren't going on during that time and the parties are entitled to speak with each other privately during that time.

ATTORNEY BUTING: Thank you. (Recess taken.)

THE COURT: I did take the opportunity to go back and review my notes from the last bail modification motion hearing. I'm not going to repeat all of the findings and matters I relied on at that time because of the fact that the defense in this case is not disputing the current level of bail at $\$ 500,000$.

But I think it is worthwhile to review the things that have changed since the last bail modification hearing, as I view them. I will note that, based on the Court's decision today,
the Court has allowed the filing of additional charges against the defendant. The number and gravity of the offenses are greater, as are the penalties that the defendant faces. Though, as noted by defense counsel, the penalties under the existing charges are already significant.

The Court further notes that the level of violence alleged in the Complaint is greater than it was before, based on the new allegations. And the Court, while keeping in mind that the defendant is innocent until proven guilty -- and the Court makes no comment on what the final disposition in this case might be, a jury will obviously make that determination -- but the statutes do direct the Court to take into consideration, in setting bail, the strength of the evidence that has been presented.

And this is no longer purely a circumstantial evidence case, based on the new allegations made by the State. And the Court would have to characterize the strength of the evidence at this point as greater than it had been in the past.

The State has also alleged that a statement on behalf of the defendant that at one
point in the proceedings, before his initial arrest, he considered flight. I think that that's not -- as it's stated, it's not an unequivocal statement.

It may reflect just the defendant's thought at the time. There is no evidence he has actually tried to flee the jurisdiction or anything like that, but it was made at a time before the charges were actually filed. And to the extent the defendant ever would have considered flight, the reasons would be greater at this stage than in the past.

Finally, although it may not be the most significant consideration, based on the fact that the defendant has now retained private counsel, is not represented by the Public Defender's Office -- and the Court has been informed that was as a result of a settlement of a lawsuit -the defendant's ability to give bail is somewhat greater than it has been in the past.

Taking those factors into account, the Court believes that the bail in this case should be increased from $\$ 500,000$ to $\$ 750,000$ and I'm going to order that bail be increased in that amount. Because of the severity of the offenses
involved and the possible penalties that the defendant faces, the Court concludes in this case that cash bail is necessary.

I'm not going to allow a bond to be used in lieu of cash. I will note to the extent that the defendant's family has assets, they could, of course, borrow against those assets and obtain cash. I'm aware of that. But both because of the severity of the offenses and the possible penalties, primarily for that reason, the Court is going to have bail remain at a cash figure and the amount will be $\$ 750,000$.

Now, before we conclude today, Counsel, I believe going back to one of the earlier motions, it appears we're going to need another motion date. I hope you brought your calendars with you. And, Mr. Kratz, I didn't say it, but if you still intend to pursue your motion to deny bail, I'm not going to start that at 10 minutes to 4 today.

I think, even though you may have witnesses here, I believe that the defense should have an opportunity to produce evidence of their own, if they wish. I believe they have that under the statute and I think they would be
entitled to specific notice that we're going to have such a hearing before we proceed. So I won't require you to make that decision today.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: If I may suggest, Judge, if the Court is going to be setting another motion, if the Court would give me leave to provide the Court with sufficient notice before that time to be heard at that new time, or to withdraw my motion one way or another, I can alert the Court what I intend to do.

THE COURT: All right. Counsel, you may be contemplating the filing of other motions that I haven't heard about today, so rather than me suggesting a date to you, I will let the attorneys tell me when you would like to meet next. I know there was going to be a defense motion relating to the Complaint.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Yes.
THE COURT: And it sounded to me like perhaps sometime less than a month from now.

ATTORNEY STRANG: I'm going to bring a motion relating to the right to a preliminary hearing on the three new charges, which the court has now ruled, in denying bail or property bond, are significant and add something. And I guess for
purpose of a preliminary hearing, I share that to a degree. And I had suggested that within 10 days -what I said earlier was from the Court signing Mr. Kratz's proposed order I can file a motion, but the fact is $I$ can do it 10 days from today. I don't need to wait for a written order since I understood the Court's ruling.

THE COURT: All right. So you are going to file a motion within 10 days relating to any challenges you have to the Amended complaint, which the Court today allowed to be filed.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Right. Say by the 27 th , which would be 10 days, if that's acceptable.

THE COURT: Mr. Kratz, any objection?
ATTORNEY KRATZ: No. At the same time, I didn't know if Mr. Strang intended to include the issue of the preliminary hearing.

ATTORNEY STRANG: That is the issue.
THE COURT: Yes, that's my understanding.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: If I may also ask, Judge,
I don't know if Mr. Strang believes that oral argument is required or if the Court would be satisfied with just written argument, my ability to respond and then just your ruling.

THE COURT: Are the parties willing to have
that matter decided on written briefs?
ATTORNEY KRATZ: That's fine, Judge.
ATTORNEY STRANG: Sure. And if the ruling goes our way, then we would have to have a telephone conference for purposes of scheduling a preliminary, I suppose.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: That's right.
THE COURT: I'm worried about things getting backed up. I would like to set contingent dates that you reserve on your calendar, so that if something has to be done it can be done. I don't want the calendar to get out of hand here. I do have the entire morning of April 13th available. I would ask the parties how they feel about that.

ATTORNEY STRANG: It's not an issue here, but for what it's worth, I know Passover begins that day. I'm clear that day. Mr. Buting has to be in another circuit court in the state.

ATTORNEY BUTING: Judge, at 1:30 I have to be in Waukesha on an oral argument.

THE COURT: All right.
ATTORNEY BUTING: I suppose if it takes about -- if we broke by 11:30.

THE COURT: I think that would work. We could start at nine. Let me do this. I'm just
going to hold that date for now. And depending on the motions that the parties file, if a hearing has to be held, $I$ would like to hold it on that date. And I would also like to be kept informed by the parties of progress being made with respect to discovery and testing, so that if there are any motions that have to be filed, they can be filed in a timely manner and I can hear them, so they don't jeopardize a September trial date.

ATTORNEY STRANG: I don't want to sit on my hands here and not give the Court fair warning, but I think it's at least possible with the March 1, March 2 developments, and now presumably further testing and much material and discovery that the State can't disclose to us because it doesn't have it yet, I think the September 5 trial date is very questionable.

It's not a calendar problem for me, I just think it's very questionable. And I can understand why the Court would not want to move a date once one is set, so I don't want to sit here and sound like I'm acquiescing or not raising at least the concern that, for all the reasons we have discussed today, just scheduling like bail
consideration and, you know, what charges Mr. Avery is facing, all of these things may also have an affect on trial scheduling.

THE COURT: Mr. Kratz, I don't know if you have any information yet about the timing of the testing that's going to be done.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: On Monday, Judge, we -- we meaning myself and the investigator involved in the case -- intend to meet directly with the Crime Lab to get those answers. And so once we have a timetable, I would be happy to provide that to Mr. Strang and Court.

THE COURT: All right.
ATTORNEY STRANG: The Court's ruling on the motion concerning fair forensic testing means that now, necessarily, the only avenue open to the defense would be sequential testing once the State's private testing is done, so that -- I don't know that we'll do that, but we may. That's what's left to us.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: If I can be heard. We have offered what's already been tested already for retesting. Defense hasn't taken us up on that yet, we'll see if they do. That is already available for retesting. That decision should be able to be made
before this new testing is done, Judge.
ATTORNEY STRANG: That's absolutely true, as to stuff seized in November, absolutely so, agreed.

THE COURT: All right. Is there anything else either party wishes to take up this afternoon?

ATTORNEY BUTING: Judge, one other matter. When you mentioned other motions that we might need, we may be able to just short circuit that. If Mr. Kratz is willing to today, I could file a motion for return of property -- I'm informed that co-counsel has already spoken to the State and reached some agreement on that, so that's fine.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else this afternoon?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: No, Judge.
THE COURT: If not, we're adjourned for today.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Thank you.
ATTORNEY STRANG: Thank you.
(Proceedings concluded.)
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disservice [1] 53/17
distinguished [1] 19/23
District [3] 2/8 2/12 2/16
divorced [1] 49/4
DNA [13] 28/20 28/22 30/1 30/11
30/24 33/1 33/23 34/8 35/12
39/1 0 39/20 40/9 40/13
DNR [1] 46/25
do [37] 4/13 5/16 5/24 8/9 11/8
11/25 17/12 22/7 23/13 23/17
23/1 8 23/20 24/8 26/1 26/5 26/12
28/25 29/9 30/22 30/23 32/9
36/24 40/3 40/4 41/16 44/13
49/13 53/5 57/9 60/15 63/10 64/5
65/12 65/25 67/19 67/24 69/6
document [2] 7/12 17/18
does [13] 10/21 11/23 16/17 19/2
25/25 26/25 38/9 40/2 51/25
52/10 53/17 53/18 55/12
doesn't [5] 22/12 31/11 43/17
56/14 66/16
doing [1] $32 / 5$
dollar [1] 45/6
dollars [4] 45/25 47/7 58/6 58/13
don't [29] $13 / 1$ 17/20 19/9 19/9
24/11 27/7 28/3 29/1 36/1 37/20
38/2 39/5 39/6 39/7 39/13 41/13
$43 / 1244 / 5$ 53/5 55/14 55/20 64/5
64/21 65/11 66/9 66/11 66/22
67/4 67/18
done [17] 27/4 27/9 28/7 28/12
28/14 29/16 35/1 35/8 35/18 36/6
44/15 45/13 65/11 65/11 67/6
67/18 68/1
doubt [1] 37/13
down [4] 32/5 35/18 51/5 51/6
dramatically [1] 53/12
drawn [1] 9/16
dress [1] $47 / 14$
due [2] 41/2 41/10

| D | examine [4] $11 / 1114 / 19$ 42/4 | Finally [3] 11/1 38/25 61/13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { during [8] 3/23 6/13 25/14 26/10 } \\ & 31 / 1659 / 959 / 1059 / 11 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | exceeds [2] 45/25 47/6 | find [6] 10/3 12/2 20/22 39/9 |
| E | /7 | finding [3] 10/6 14/8 42/15 |
| each [7] 3/15 | exceptions | findings [2] 42/3 59/18 fine [3] 30/14 65/2 68/1 |
| 44/21 59/11 | exculpatory [3] 36/14 36/18 40/7 | finger [2] 15/24 19/10 |
| earlier [5] 25/8 31/9 57/2 62/ | excuse [2] 9/20 49/15 | fingerprints [1] 40/9 |
| 64/3 | existing [1] 60/6 | finished [1] 34/2 |
| earliest [1] 48/2 | exonerate [2] 19/11 19/15 | firearm [1] 12/23 |
| early [1] 56/19 | expect [1] 51/17 | first [22] 3/3 7/8 7/21 9/3 12/21 |
| easily [2] 28/9 28/14 | expects [1] 3/25 | 13/12 13/21 13/24 14/9 17/5 |
| Easter [1] 47/23 | expedites [1] 44/14 | 18/15 20/1 26/2 33/19 41/1 44/23 |
| effective [1] 15/24 | expert [9] 28/10 28/11 28/25 35/7 | 44/24 52/1 5 55/2 55/3 56/8 57/11 |
| efforts [1] 25/11 | 35/17 36/1 36/3 36/25 38/11 | first-degree [8] 7/21 12/21 13/12 |
| either [9] 3/22 6/12 6/23 24/19 | exposure [1] 56/14 | 13/24 14/9 17/5 18/15 57/11 |
| 25/8 25/21 29/18 40/23 68/6 | expressly [1] 43/13 | five [4] 29/14 37/24 50/13 56/11 |
| Electronic [1] 51/9 | extend [2] 18/22 31/12 | flee [2] 54/5 61/7 |
| elite [1] 30/5 | extends [1] 18/10 | flight [2] 61/2 61/11 |
| else[19] 15/21 19/10 21/23 22/2 | extensive [1] 55/10 | Flowers [1] 21/13 |
| 37/10 50/18 58/21 68/6 68/14 | extent [4] 42/6 42/18 61/10 62/5 | focusing [1] 13/23 |
| embraced [1] 5/9 | extenuating [1] 43/16 | folks [1] 59/8 |
| emphasize [1] 32/25 | extraction [2] 33/24 3 | follow [3] 34/22 40/1 46/21 |
| encouraged [1] 3/15 | extremely [1] 3/14 | followed [3] 35/4 35/9 38/23 |
| encumbrance [1] 51/2 | eyeball [1] 39/15 | follows [1] 41/19 |
| [1] 23/17 | F | fond [1] 13/5 |
| enforcement [8] 14/5 14/6 25/10 | F-r-a-n-s-z-c-z-a-k [1] 42/23 | foregoing [2] 69/7 69/7 |
| 40/12 41/21 41/25 51/15 58/18 | faces [2] 60/4 62/2 | forensic[5] 24/18 40/10 44/8 |
| engaging [1] 19/18 | facing [1] 67/2 | 44/11 67/15 |
| enough [2] 39/19 39/20 | fact [12] 4/12 10/1 | forgotten [1] 47/12 |
| ensure [1] 25/18 | 38/5 38/15 44/4 53/8 53/25 59/19 | form [1] 3/12 |
| entire [4] 17/4 29/21 48/19 65/13 | 61/14 64/5 | formal [2] 7/12 54/24 |
| entirely [1] 58/4 | factors [5] 52/16 52/24 53/21 54/9 | forth [2] 12/4 54/15 |
| entitle [1] 58/8 | 61/21 | fortuitously [1] 30/2 |
| entitled [6] 23/10 42/1 42/1 | facts [3] 9/14 18/10 20/22 | forward [2] 6/14 50/2 |
| 57/20 59/11 63/1 | factual [6] 13/6 13/16 13/20 15/4 | found [2] 29/18 38/14 |
| equate [1] 20/18 | 17/4 24/5 | founder [1] 12/14 |
| erroneous [3] 27/2 29/20 40/14 | failing [1] 48/22 | four [6] 9/14 9/23 10/1 10/24 12/1 |
| erroneously [1] 30/16 | fair [8] 24/18 31/5 45/23 46/15 | 14/24 |
| especially [3] 20/2 25/7 33/1 | 47/4 47/6 66/12 67/15 | Frankly [1] 55/24 |
| essentially [3] 21/21 42/25 55/11 | fairly [1] 55/10 | Franszczak [1] 42/22 |
| establish [3] 21/4 21/6 21/8 | false [5] 7/22 13/17 14/10 17/6 | fraudulent [3] 29/19 30/8 30/10 |
| established [2] 13/1 15/17 | 29/22 | fraudulently [1] 30/16 |
| establishing [1] 57/23 | family [1] 62/6 | free [1] 47/17 |
| estate [2] 52/1 52/3 | family's [2] 48/17 56/2 | Froehlich [1] 2/15 |
| evade [1] 48/11 | far [2] 2/23 57/5 | full [1] 48/3 |
| evaded [1] 48/13 | farm [1] 46/22 | fully [5] 4/2 44/4 51/10 51/12 |
| Evanow [1] 15/2 | fashion [2] 14/16 50/21 | 51/16 |
| even [4] 47/12 55/17 56/11 62/21 | favor [1] 20/11 | functional [1] 57/10 |
| event [2] 28/20 40/2 | favored [1] 31/18 | fundamentally [1] 47 |
| ever [3] 18/25 43/23 61/10 | FBI [1] 30/4 | further [11] 2/15 3/11 5/2 5/11 |
| every [1] 35/16 | feel [3] 9/8 44/15 65/1 | 24/13 31/12 39/20 49/10 50/20 |
| Everybody [1] 56/2 | feels [1] 9/4 | 60/7 66/14 |
| everyone [1] 3/21 | felon [1] 12/23 | future [4] 5/13 40/6 52/21 53/20 |
| everything [2] 29/21 48/24 | felony [2] 7/13 42/9 | G |
| 11/8 11/23 14/21 18/13 25/16 | few [2] 6/19 32/18 | G-a-h-n [1] 2/11 |
| 25/20 26/25 28/24 30/24 31/2 | figure [1] 62/11 | GAHN [6] 1/13 2/11 $2 / 13$ 32/10 |
| 31/17 31/21 33/15 33/19 34/18 | file [14] 8/14 8/20 12/10 16/25 | 32/12 32/13 |
| 35/21 36/10 36/11 36/14 36/17 | 17/14 17/22 23/2 23/7 23/9 23/19 | game [1] 47/16 |
| 36/20 38/14 39/3 40/10 41/20 | 64/4 64/9 66/2 68/10 | gave [1] 14/4 |
| 41/21 42/2 42/11 42/14 57/22 | filed [17] 2/4 7/10 7/25 17/9 17/10 | gene [1] 35/4 |
| 60/17 60/19 60/22 61/6 62/23 | 18/2 22/24 24/9 32/15 40/21 | general [1] 44/17 |
| evidentiary [1] 55/9 | 45/14 46/9 52/11 61/9 64/11 66/7 | generally [2] 36/9 36/1 |
| evidently [1] 14/4 | 66/8 | generation [1] 26/10 |
| ex[3] 15/1 49/3 49/23 | filing [7] 4/19 6/1 7/15 7/17 8/23 | genotype [2] 28/20 35/5 |
| ex-wife [2] 49/3 49/23 | 60/1 63/12 |  |
| exact [1] 15/9 | filings [2] 5/13 8/2 | 26/13 36/12 36/14 36/22 43/6 |
| exactly [1] 49/13 | filming [3] 6/13 31/25 59/5 | 47/17 49/23 50/3 65/12 67/10 |
| examination [6] 17/21 17/24 18/5 | filtered [1] 58/17 | get-out-of-jail-free [1] 47/17 |
| 18/13 23/11 23/22 | final [1] 60/12 | gets [3] $25 / 1625 / 2133 / 18$ |

## G

getting [6] 27/1 36/19 47/9 49/25 50/1 65/9
give [6] 4/10 23/8 23/19 61/19 63/6 66/12
given [7] 25/5 31/8 34/25 35/1 35/2 40/14 53/13
go [6] 10/15 32/24 35/17 36/3 51/5 59/16
goes [4] $21 / 16$ 27/20 45/6 65/4
going [45] 3/4 6/24 9/7 10/15
20/14 23/1 27/7 29/6 29/24 32/10 $32 / 15$ 33/8 33/19 34/11 39/5
39/1 3 40/21 43/9 44/7 48/2 48/19 48/22 51/5 52/14 56/15 56/22
58/24 59/1 59/5 59/8 59/10 59/17
61/24 62/4 62/11 62/14 62/15
62/19 63/1 63/5 63/16 63/21 64/8 66/1 67/6
gone [3] 12/25 31/8 51/24
good [4] 2/18 2/22 20/10 38/22
got [4] 19/25 41/4 48/11 56/9
grant [7] 12/10 23/1 32/7 37/3
40/2 40/17 43/11
granted [2] 35/15 39/2
granting [2] 43/18 44/6
gravity [2] 53/16 60/3
great [2] 9/22 14/12
greater [5] 60/3 60/8 60/22 61/11 61/20
grounds [2] 17/13 18/4
guarantee [1] 39/11
guess [6] 6/5 11/21 33/12 39/25
49/1 1 63/25
guidelines [1] 35/4
guilty [1] 60/11
guy [1] 50/4

## H

had [13] 3/7 21/7 29/19 38/22
45/22 47/19 47/21 50/15 53/23
56/24 60/22 64/2 69/13
Halbach [1] 10/19
half [7] 39/11 45/6 45/25 47/7
56/9 58/6 58/12
hand [1] 65/12
handful [1] 37/24
handled [2] 25/15 25/16
handling [2] 31/17 31/21
hands [1] 66/12
hanging [1] 58/3
happen [1] 39/14
happened [2] 58/13 58/14
happens [2] 33/13 34/3
happy [2] 5/16 67/11
has [56] 2/13 4/24 5/24 7/10 7/13
7/25 9/17 10/11 11/25 13/4 15/12
16/12 20/9 20/16 22/10 22/16
26/5 27/23 28/12 28/17 28/18
29/13 30/25 31/8 32/20 33/10
$33 / 1136 / 1838 / 1741 / 1643 / 23$
46/1 49/2 50/11 51/19 52/5 52/17
53/11 55/6 55/15 57/6 58/11 60/1
60/17 60/24 61/6 61/15 61/17
61/20 62/6 63/24 65/11 65/17
66/2 68/12 69/8
hasn't [1] 67/23
hat [1] 58/4
have [105]
haven't [2] 56/11 63/13
having [2] 27/4 35/13
Hazlewood [1] 49/6
he [46] $9 / 4$ 14/9 $15 / 1815 / 20$ 15/20
15/20 19/16 23/4 23/5 27/16
28/14 28/17 45/9 46/16 46/20
$47 / 947 / 1247 / 1347 / 1547 / 17$
47/18 47/19 47/21 47/23 48/6 48/19 48/21 48/24 48/24 49/3 49/4 49/5 49/1 4 49/16 49/19 49/20 50/17 51/5 51/8 56/25 57/3 57/15 57/16 58/11 61/2 61/6 he's [16] 22/1 47/12 47/16 48/2 48/10 48/10 48/14 49/19 49/21 51/4 54/1 56/15 56/20 56/21 56/22 57/19
heading [1] 47/23
hear [6] 7/7 9/9 14/15 25/2 44/23 66/8
heard [10] 9/3 24/4 36/5 36/21
48/3 50/8 55/25 63/8 63/13 67/21
hearing [19] $1 / 47 / 1712 / 640 / 20$
42/7 42/19 55/9 55/10 57/21 58/8
58/25 59/8 59/17 59/24 63/2
63/23 64/1 64/17 66/2
hearsay[4] 15/4 20/7 21/14 21/15
held [2] 20/12 66/3
helpful [1] 38/11
hence [1] 16/23
here [40] $2 / 23$ 6/11 $12 / 15$ 12/17
13/23 14/13 14/16 15/6 16/25 17/5 18/14 19/12 22/8 30/15 33/15 39/6 41/8 44/6 45/5 45/11 $46 / 12$ 47/3 47/13 47/18 48/4 48/14 48/21 49/2 50/25 51/25 52/4 53/4 57/1 57/8 57/15 62/22 65/12 65/15 66/12 66/22
hereby [1] 69/6
high [2] 16/4 16/8
him [13] 14/21 27/17 44/2 46/17
47/14 47/15 48/13 49/4 49/9 51/8 51/13 56/19 56/22
himself [5] $10 / 17$ 19/16 21/21 $22 / 1$ 22/12
his [28] 2/25 8/6 8/7 9/19 9/20
10/17 11/16 27/17 46/9 46/21
47/19 47/21 47/23 48/5 48/15
48/23 48/25 49/3 49/7 49/9 49/10
49/1 1 49/20 49/23 54/5 56/17
57/2 61/1
history [3] 25/6 40/15 48/11
hold [4] 5/20 21/16 66/1 66/3
homestead [1] 48/17
homicide [2] 12/22 57/12
Hon [1] $1 / 11$
honestly [1] 50/10
Honor [11] 2/19 9/11 25/1 32/14
33/13 37/11 44/10 51/3 54/19
55/4 59/3
hope [1] 62/16
hopefully [1] 5/22
horrible [1] 30/6
house [2] 49/21 51/11
how [7] 27/7 34/8 34/19 34/19
55/14 55/16 65/14
huge [2] $33 / 1533 / 17$
human [1] 43/22
hundred [1] 57/8
Hurley [1] 2/24
I
I'II [1] 59/2
I'm [45] 2/20 4/17 5/16 6/24 8/7 9/2 9/4 9/7 10/15 14/15 15/2 22/15 30/13 32/11 32/14 40/20
40/21 40/22 43/9 43/22 44/7
$44 / 1249 / 1251 / 2152 / 1453 / 13$
$54 / 855 / 21$ 56/2 56/4 58/3 58/24
59/1 59/8 59/17 61/23 62/4 62/8 62/19 63/21 65/8 65/17 65/25
66/23 68/11
idea [1] 51/10
identical [1] 41/8
identified [1] 30/1
if [62] 6/7 6/10 8/9 8/22 $11 / 111 / 6$
11/9 16/8 $17 / 21$ 18/21 20/13 23/9
23/14 24/4 24/23 26/5 26/22
27/16 28/2 28/22 35/16 37/15
38/6 39/8 43/4 44/13 46/20 48/6
48/7 48/12 48/24 51/4 51/13
$52 / 1355 / 157 / 857 / 1557 / 1958 / 5$
58/14 59/5 62/18 62/24 63/4 63/5
63/6 64/13 64/1 6 64/20 64/21
64/22 65/3 65/10 65/22 65/23
66/2 66/6 67/4 67/21 67/24 68/9
68/17
Illinois [2] 28/13 36/4
illuminating [1] 18/9
immediately [1] 6/22
implicated [1] 21/1
implicating [2] 22/1 22/2
implications [2] 31/8 32/4
implicit [1] 23/3
implied [1] 31/9
importance [1] 33/3
important [4] 33/4 34/6 54/9 54/17
importantly [1] 46/15
impose [1] 50/23
impossible [1] 34/16
imprisonment [4] 7/22 13/18
14/10 17/6
in [235]
inadmissible [3] 14/17 14/23 17/7
incarcerated [2] 27/14 27/16
incentives [1] 57/10
incidents [1] 43/20
inclination [1] 56/19
include [4] 14/23 40/9 40/11 64/16
included [3] 9/5 12/16 54/24
includes [1] 54/4
including [6] $4 / 5$ 7/21 16/10 28/13
50/25 53/22
incompetence [1] 29/20
incorporated [1] 13/4
incorporation [1] 13/20
increase [6] 52/14 54/4 54/18
54/21 56/3 58/3
increased [2] 61/23 61/24
increasing [2] 50/25 58/6
incubator [1] 31/24
inculpate [1] 19/9
inculpates [1] 19/16
inculpatory [1] 36/17
indeed [2] 10/20 51/23
independent [11] 26/20 26/21
26/24 27/4 27/11 27/21 36/1 36/2
36/8 36/23 39/12
indicate [4] 3/1 3/6 3/20 55/16
indicated [1] 3/9
indicates [1] 28/4
indication [1] 28/24
indicia [1] 22/6
individuals [1] 40/8
indulgence [1] 6/8
inferences [1] 9/15
information [27] $4 / 64 / 164 / 18$
$4 / 206 / 16 / 247 / 128 / 38 / 158 / 16$
8/21 9/18 9/21 9/23 10/1 12/11
17/19 23/24 41/20 42/1 42/13

|  | $38 / 438 / 1340 / 2254 / 11$ | language [1] 9/5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| information... [6] 43/6 51/22 52/2 | 48/18 | last [9] 29/14 39/24 40/21 44/20 |
| 53/23 54/3 67/5 | itself [3] 8/24 26/9 31/22 | 52/25 53/1 53/12 59/16 59/23 |
| informed [3] 61/17 66/5 68/11 inherently [2] 16/13 16/13 | J | $\begin{aligned} & \text { later [5] } \\ & 34 / 7 \end{aligned} 6 / 20 \quad 17 / 10 \quad 27 / 16 \quad 30 / 2$ |
| initial [1] 61/1 | jail [6] 27/18 47/17 47/21 47/22 | law [14] 1/16 14/5 14/5 15/11 |
| inmates [2] 50/6 58/16 | 50/4 51/4 | 16/22 20/9 22/2 25/10 29/15 |
| innocent [11] 29/25 47/12 47/13 | Jeff [1] 2/15 | 40/12 41/21 41/24 51/15 58/17 |
| 47/18 47/20 47/22 47/24 48/8 | jeopardize [2] 28/1 66/9 | lawsuit [1] 61/18 |
| 48/10 53/4 60/11 | jeopardy [2] 29/4 33/9 | lawyer [2] 16/7 51/25 |
| inquiry [1] 17/17 | JEROME [2] 1/15 2/19 | lawyers [1] 13/5 |
| inspection [2] 42/1 42/13 | judge [26] 1/11 4/13 5/18 7/9 9/10 | lay [1] 16/2 |
| instances [4] 26/22 29/22 29/25 | 10/21 11/13 12/11 18/21 19/25 | lead [2] 2/9 57/2 |
| 30/7 | 37/9 42/10 49/6 52/9 54/23 55/12 | learn [1] 26/15 |
| integrity [1] 37/8 | 55/24 58/23 63/4 64/20 65/2 | learned [3] 29/13 29/13 52/24 |
| intend [5] 4/2 11/23 62/18 63/9 | 65/19 67/7 68/1 68/7 68/16 | learns [1] 26/14 |
| 67/9 | jumped [1] 47/15 | least [17] 5/20 15/1 15/12 17/15 |
| intended [4] 11/6 11/21 19/14 | jurisdiction [2] 54/6 61/7 | 18/10 18/15 18/25 19/1 19/13 |
| 64/16 | jury [1] 60/13 | 25/18 27/13 43/14 50/3 50/14 |
| intending [1] 4/9 | just [28] 11/20 11/21 15/10 15/11 | 57/6 66/13 66/24 |
| intentional [2] 12/22 57/12 | 16/14 18/20 19/9 19/9 27/18 30/6 | leave [10] 8/19 8/21 12/10 16/25 |
| interest [1] 21/17 | $31 / 1532 / 1833 / 233 / 1633 / 17$ | 17/14 17/22 18/3 49/22 53/16 |
| interests [1] 19/22 | 36/16 37/6 37/8 37/11 48/16 57/4 | 63/6 |
| interfere [1] 26/8 | 61/5 64/23 64/24 65/25 66/20 | led [2] 10/18 22/10 |
| interference [1] 31/15 | 66/25 68/9 | Lee [1] 15/14 |
| intermediate [1] 58/9 | iustice[2] 48/11 48/12 | left [4] 13/9 35/10 39/22 67/19 |
| interrelated [1] 21/25 | K | legal [3] 3/24 46/19 54/1 |
| into [21] $6 / 1213 / 2516 / 817 / 17$ $18 / 831 / 1232 / 2233 / 833 / 933 / 16$ | K | legally [3] 18/6 21/4 47/13 legislature [1] 43/17 |
| 36/3 36/12 36/14 46/19 46/25 | keeping [1] 60/10 | lengthy [1] 10/10 |
| 49/17 49/24 50/1 52/23 60/15 | Ken [1] 2/8 | less [2] 31/18 63/20 |
| 61/21 | KENNETH [1] 1/13 | lessen [2] 32/3 33/6 |
| introduce [3] 11/9 20/6 33/7 | kept [1] 66/4 | lesser [1] 26/6 |
| intrusion [1] 6/12 | kidnapping [5] 7/22 13/17 14/10 | let [9] 9/7 12/16 12/16 17/25 19/5 |
| intrusiveness [1] 34/15 | 17/6 18/16 | 23/20 55/15 63/14 65/25 |
| investigation [1] 24/21 | kind [1] 54/20 | let's [1] 13/7 |
| investigator [1] 67/8 | kinds [5] 19/19 19/23 30/22 38/18 | letter [2] 20/13 46/9 |
| invite [1] 50/23 | 50/6 | letters [3] 49/3 49/16 49/23 |
| invited [1] 5/13 | know [28] 15/19 27/7 30/21 30/22 | level [4] 9/12 46/22 59/20 60/7 |
| invites [2] 11/19 53/8 | 36/1 39/5 39/6 39/13 47/10 47/15 | lieu [1] 62/5 |
| involved [8] 15/19 15/20 25/9 | 47/19 48/18 50/5 52/4 55/1 55/14 | life [4] 47/17 48/15 56/8 56/13 |
| $31 / 1041 / 743 / 2462 / 167 / 8$ | 56/13 57/5 57/7 57/13 58/6 63/15 | light [1] 25/7 |
| involvement [1] 16/1 | 64/16 64/21 65/16 67/1 67/4 | like [18] 5/10 14/8 30/25 31/1 |
| involves [3] 24/18 55/9 55/11 | 67/18 | 35/25 41/12 43/18 47/15 50/15 |
| involving [1] 20/4 | knowingly [1] 19/18 | 55/19 61/8 63/15 63/19 65/9 66/3 |
| is [190] | knowledge [2] 37/2 69/14 | $66 / 466 / 2366 / 25$ |
| issue [23] 3/18 7/5 17/3 20/24 | knows [6] 7/10 9/11 15/4 39/7 | likelihood [2] 32/4 53/19 |
| 24/14 24/16 24/25 25/25 27/15 | 47/10 56/24 | likely [1] 39/2 |
| $32 / 1133 / 1135 / 23$ 35/25 41/1 | Knudson [1] 14/25 | likewise [1] 43/4 |
| 41/18 46/12 46/14 53/13 58/22 | Krajnek [1] 51/25 | Lilly [4] 11/4 15/14 19/8 19/24 |
| 59/4 64/17 64/18 65/15 | KRATZ [17] 1/13 2/8 5/10 5/15 | limit [1] 25/19 |
| issued [1] 53/17 | 5/17 7/7 9/3 9/6 18/18 23/6 32/11 | limited [2] 3/14 3/24 |
| issues [11] 8/5 11/13 11/14 22/14 | 52/8 58/21 62/17 64/14 67/4 | limiting [1] 3/5 |
| 23/4 23/21 33/2 36/12 37/8 46/25 | 68/10 | line [1] $8 / 18$ |
| 47/1 | Kratz's [2] 6/6 64/4 | list [1] 10/11 |
| it [91] | L | literally [2] 15/23 46/22 |
| it's [60] $2 / 2$ 3/1 $14 / 7$ 5/3 6/6 8/12 | L | little [4] 5/11 21/2 49/18 57/15 |
| $8 / 248 / 249 / 6 \quad 13 / 1 \quad 13 / 3 \quad 14 / 11$ | lab [26] 24/20 25/21 26/3 27/21 | lived [2] 48/14 50/17 |
| 14/11 14/13 15/11 15/23 15/23 | 28/2 28/5 28/18 29/2 30/4 30/5 | livelihood [2] 48/19 48/25 |
| 15/24 18/10 20/17 25/6 25/6 27/7 | 30/12 30/15 33/17 33/1834/17 | Lives [1] 48/15 |
| 27/24 28/14 29/2 30/15 31/23 | 34/21 35/21 36/4 36/23 37/7 37/9 | local [1] 51/25 |
| $31 / 2532 / 132 / 633 / 1733 / 2135 / 1$ | 40/24 41/23 43/1 43/23 67/9 | long [2] 27/7 48/7 |
| 35/6 35/21 35/22 38/3 38/16 39/1 | Lab's [1] 44/1 | longer [3] 27/18 52/18 60/18 |
| 39/16 40/20 43/2 46/15 48/12 | Labor [1] 48/5 | look[11] 9/13 14/23 35/7 35/7 |
| 48/17 48/25 49/15 50/8 50/19 | laboratories [4] 41/22 42/2 42/11 | 35/17 39/15 41/15 47/15 51/19 |
| 52/6 56/5 58/4 61/3 61/3 65/15 | 42/14 | 51/20 59/1 |
| 65/16 66/13 66/19 66/20 | laboratory [9] 32/23 32/24 33/1 | looked [4] 37/22 41/1 41/5 56/11 |
| item [6] 10/15 10/15 33/16 36/8 | 33/5 33/8 33/14 35/19 42/4 42/16 | looking [3] $7 / 3$ 34/17 56/2 |
| 39/3 44/20 | laboratory's [2] 42/3 42/15 | lose [2] 46/22 48/24 |
| items [17] 24/20 27/10 33/15 | labs [7] 28/12 29/14 29/17 30/24 | lot [1] 56/5 |
| 33/17 33/18 34/2 34/4 34/18 | 31/4 38/20 43/21 | loves[1] 46/16 |
| 35/20 37/13 37/15 37/17 37/25 | lack [2] 7/16 14/11 | low [1] 38/23 |

mini [2] $55 / 11$ 55/19
minimum [2] $31 / 1843 / 16$
minutes [1] 62/19
misapprehends [1] 46/11
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miss [1] 47/2
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moment [2] 5/1 49/14
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Monday [1] 67/7
monetary [2] 50/21 50/24
Monigas [1] $41 / 6$
monitoring [1] 51/9
Monopoly [1] 47/16
month [1] 63/20
months [1] 48/7
moot [1] 17/17
more [10] 16/18 $18 / 8$ 25/12 30/13
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57/8
morning [3] 2/3 55/8 65/13
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most [8] 13/23 30/4 37/15 37/18
40/13 49/5 54/9 61/13
mostly [1] $37 / 6$
motion [61] $1 / 43 / 53 / 85 / 25 / 5$
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29/11 40/3 40/18 40/20 44/8 44/9
44/11 44/19 44/23 45/6 52/5
52/11 52/12 52/13 52/14 54/14
54/24 55/2 55/3 55/5 55/23 55/24
56/1 56/3 56/4 58/2 59/17 62/16
62/18 63/5 63/8 63/16 63/22 64/4
64/9 67/15 68/10
motions [9] 2/4 29/9 39/1 44/21
62/15 63/12 66/2 66/7 68/8
move [5] 6/14 24/1 24/14 26/12 66/21
moved [2] 32/1 51/2
Mr [9] $11 / 1632 / 1032 / 1132 / 12$
32/13 45/2 52/8 62/17 67/1
Mr. [80]
Mr. and [1] 45/19
Mr. Avery [11] 2/20 7/20 10/18 11/6 14/18 27/13 51/12 51/16 53/4 54/1 54/16
Mr. Avery's [4] 45/9 52/21 53/19 54/9
Mr. Buting [6] 16/11 24/24 37/10 44/25 51/7 65/17
Mr. Dassey [5] 14/13 14/19 19/15 19/15 22/20
Mr. Dassey's [2] 11/7 19/13
Mr. Gahn [1] 2/13
Mr. Krajnek [1] 51/25
Mr. Kratz [12] 5/10 5/15 5/17 7/7 9/3 9/6 18/18 23/6 58/21 64/14 67/4 68/10
Mr. Kratz's [2] 6/6 64/4
Mr. Strang [32] 4/14 4/21 4/22 6/5 7/3 7/25 8/6 8/11 9/9 9/17 9/19 10/7 $11 / 111 / 1912 / 1218 / 2119 / 6$ 19/8 23/8 25/8 32/9 44/24 45/1 52/10 52/17 53/3 55/17 55/23
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|Mr. Strang's [3] 23/3 52/12 55/3
Mrs. [1] 45/19
Mrs. Avery [1] 45/19
much [12] 9/23 18/1 18/5 19/23
$31 / 3$ 34/8 50/10 50/11 55/14
56/1456/1866/15
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64/19 64/23 66/11 69/9 69/13
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myself [3] 4/21 25/9 67/8
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names [1] 21/10
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necessary [5] 3/17 10/5 47/25 52/2 62/3
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or [112]
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$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { original }[8] & 7 / 23 & 12 / 19 & 13 / 6 & 13 / 9\end{array}$
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piece [2] $36 / 1036 / 17$
pieces [1] 16/15
place [8] 27/12 30/22 33/8 33/24
34/20 48/17 52/6 57/10
PLAINTIFF [1] 1/4
plans [2] 54/5 54/16
pleadings [2] 9/21 23/9
please [1] 2/6
point [14] 8/19 15/16 17/24 19/10 27/19 39/5 39/24 40/8 46/18 46/20 47/2 55/22 60/22 61/1
pointing [1] 15/24
points [1] 15/21
police [6] 14/13 15/19 16/6 21/12
51/14 56/20
portion [1] 31/25
portions [3] 25/14 25/17 32/18
posit [1] 12/14
position [1] 37/4
positions [1] 4/15
positive [1] 40/12
possession [1] 12/23
possibility [3] 25/19 43/22 58/15
possible [5] 25/9 56/9 62/1 62/9
66/13
post [1] 45/20
posting [4] 45/12 46/11 51/18
58/12
potential [3] 33/7 33/22 38/12
potentially [1] 36/13
practical [2] 47/8 47/10
practice [1] 54/14
precautions [1] $38 / 18$
precedent [1] 32/22
precisely [2] 20/24 41/7
prefer [1] 8/9
prejudicial [2] 8/23 17/2
preliminary [14] 7/17 12/6 17/21
17/24 18/5 18/13 23/11 23/22
42/7 42/19 63/22 64/1 64/17 65/5
prepare [1] 23/6
prepared [6] 8/7 51/21 54/23 55/4 55/14 69/8
presence [1] 14/7
present [12] 2/17 6/25 9/12 24/19
25/14 26/10 28/10 29/5 31/16
32/16 34/9 39/20
presented [1] 60/17
presently [1] 27/14
preservation [1] 40/5
preserved [2] 32/3 40/16
presiding [1] $42 / 10$
press [4] 3/12 3/13 3/16 3/23
prestigious [1] 30/5
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { presumably }[5] & 13 / 8 & 16 / 6 & 27 / 9\end{array}$
50/3 66/14
presume [1] 53/4
presumed [2] 15/8 47/13
presumption [4] 15/10 16/16
16/18 46/4
presumptively [6] 15/7 16/14
47/20 47/22 47/24 48/8
prevent [1] 38/18
previously [3] 53/17 53/21 54/22
primarily [2] 22/13 62/10
principles [3] 18/23 19/4 19/5
prior [5] 42/5 42/17 44/1 53/24
58/25
prison [3] 44/3 49/4 49/12
pristine [1] 31/2
private [2] 61/15 67/18
privately [1] 59/11
privileged [2] 6/23 41/23
probable [15] 9/12 9/13 12/2
12/24 13/11 13/16 17/11 18/4 21/4 21/6 21/8 21/19 22/18 24/2 24/6
probably [4] 14/9 37/21 38/6
50/13
problem [7] 12/17 13/22 14/15

| P |  | [2] $29 / 2$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| problem... [4] 16/21 34/1 38/15 | 38/25 47/3 | evant [2] 36/13 41/19 |
|  | questionable[2] 66/18 66/20 | bility [10] 8/25 10/110 |
| problematical [1] 11/11 problems [3] $29 / 2130 / 2438 / 20$ | questioned [2] 15/18 16/5 | $16 / 9 \quad 17 / 3 \quad 19 / 6 \quad 19 / 719 /$ |
| procedurally [1] 17/17 | Quitclaim [1] 45/14 | reliable [6] 14/8 15/5 15/7 |
| procedure [1] 55/20 | quite [4] $3 / 244 / 1710 / 2030 / 18$ | 16/19 16/22 |
|  |  | reiled [2] $49 / 2$ |
| proceedings [9] 1/21 3/24 13/2 <br> 23/17 59/6 59/9 61/1 68/21 69/13 | R | ng [1] $24 / 3$ |
|  | raise [2] 13/3 54/20 | remain [1] 62/11 |
| process [24] 25 25/12 $25 / 1826 / 9$$27 / 1928 / 1931 / 1232 / 133 / 5$ | raised [1] | remains [2] 22/4 27 |
|  | raises [1] 19/6 | dy [3] $26 / 6$ 26/1 |
| 33/24 34/2 34/7 34/11 34/18 | raising [2] 46/9 66/23 | repeat [1] 59/18 |
| 34/19 34/19 34/25 35/8 35/12 | rare [1] 37/1 | peated [1] 26/24 |
| $36 / 2539 / 1841 / 241 / 1044 / 14$ | rather [5] 8/1 |  |
|  |  | repetition [1] 15 |
| processes [1]proclivities [1]34/13$56 / 17$ | onale | ort [2] 50/7 51/13 |
|  | [2] | reported [3] 1/22 20/2 |
|  | RE [1] 35/5 | Reporter [3] 1/23 69/5 69/1 |
|  | RE-data [1] 35 | reporting [1] 30/11 |
| progress [1]prohibit [1]26/529/3 |  |  |
|  | reached [3] 4/19 5/6 68/13 | representative [4] 25/14 26/15 |
| ( ${ }^{\text {prohibit [1] } 29 / 3} \begin{aligned} & \text { prohibits [1] } 43 / 13 \\ & \text { proof [5] 9/12 31/2 48/4 57/22 }\end{aligned}$ | reaching [1] 5/1 | 29/5 31/16 |
| proof[5] 9/12 31/2 48/4 57/22 $58 / 10$ | read [3] 21/2 55 | sentatives [1] 6/ sented [1] 61/16 |
| properly [1] 44/15 | real [6] 45/17 46/6 47/3 51/18 | al [1] 19/1 |
|  | 51/25 52/3 | request [18] 6/3 7/8 24/19 |
| property [21] 45/12 45/17 45/20 45/21 45/22 46/5 46/7 46/12 | realistic [1] | 32/16 34/16 40/23 41/7 42/3 |
|  | realize [1] $34 / 8$ | 43/11 43/1844/7 52/4 54/3 54/18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 46 / 1346 / 1947 / 547 / 648 / 1649 / 1 \\ & 50 / 1250 / 1751 / 1251 / 1854 / 21 \end{aligned}$ | really [11] $8 / 25$ 13/22 15/16 16/1 | 54/19 55/6 57/20 |
|  | 22/25 37/17 47/1 50/11 50/19 | requested [1] 52/20 |
| 63/24 68/11 | 56/1457/9 | require [3] 11/12 17/9 63/3 |
| proposed [9] 8/17 12/13 13/3 <br> 13/19 14/2 17/15 22/21 23/24 | realm [1] 58/15 | required [4] 10/5 12/6 45/9 64/ |
|  | reason [6] 17/12 22/19 29/11 38/4 $38 / 1662 / 10$ | requirement [2] 7/16 7/16 requirements [1] 4/24 |
|  | reasonable [2] 9/15 48/2 | requires [3] 9/13 28/5 53/8 |
| prosecuting [1]prosecution [3]P2/121/3 | reasonableness [1] 45/4 | requiring [1] 27/17 |
|  | reasonably [2] 45/8 51/3 | ead [1] 55/8 |
| prosecutions [1] 7/13 | reasons [4] 34/23 44/5 61/11 | erve [1] 65/10 |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { Prosecutor [2] 2/9 2/14 } \\ & \text { prosecutors [2] 1/14 30/18 }\end{aligned}\right.$ | 66/24 |  |
|  | rebuttal [1] 18/1 | resolve [2] 5/23 31/11 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { prospect [1] } & 58 / 12 \\ \text { protocol [2] } & 35 / 2\end{array}$ | recall [1] 52/20 received [3] $3 / 2$ | respect [5] 19/13 23/20 52/7 55/5 |
| protocols [1] 38/22 <br> prove [2] 40/12 48/4 | (eaceived [3] $3 / 25 \quad 6 / 38 / 7$ |  |
|  | recently [2] 28/13 56/11 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { response [7] } & 5 / 13 \\ \text { rell }\end{array}$ |
|  | recess [5] 7/4 58/25 59/4 59/9 | 32/16 41/4 56/3 58/7 |
|  | 59/14 | tricted [1] 51/8 |
| 63/6 67/11provided [5] | recesses [1] 6/13 | restrictiveness [1] 51/1 |
|  | recited [2] 10/13 10/2 recognize [1] 22/9 | result [3] 29/22 37/1861/18 resulted [2] 29/23 44/2 |
| provided [5] <br> 43/4 43/7 <br> provides [2] 28/19 43/5 | recollection [1] 5/3 | resulting [1] 30/9 |
| provides [2] 28/19 43/5 <br> providing [3] 9/23 10/3 55/18 <br> public [8] 3/5 4/6 4/16 4/19 29/13 | $\begin{array}{lllll}  & \\ \begin{array}{llll} \text { record } \\ 5 / 4 & 53 / 24 \end{array} & 2 / 6 & 2 / 14 & 3 / 2 & 3 / 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { results [7] } 26 / 1027 / 2 \text { 28/20 } 29 / 3 \\ & 30 / 1731 / 640 / 12 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | recorded [1] 32/2 |  |
|  | records [1] $4 / 6$ | retaining [1] 51/24 |
| purely [1] 60/18 | recounting [1] 10/17 | retesting [2] 67/23 67/25 |
| purpose [3] 24/7 46/11 64/1 <br> purposes [5] 5/5 13/2 40/19 59/7 | recovered [1] $10 / 12$ | return [1] $68 / 11$ |
|  | reference [1] 13/5 | review [5] 22/6 29/15 40/16 |
| ```65/5 pursue [1] 62/18 put [4] 48/3 48/19 48/22 49/17``` | reflect [3] 2/15 53/19 | 59/22 |
|  |  | re |
| Q | regardless [1] 47/4 | 23/2 |
| quadruple [1] 58/18 | reiterated [1] $4 / 24$ | 24/10 24/16 32/9 40/19 41/2 |
| quality [1] $35 / 3$ <br> quantifiable [1] 39/19 |  | $41 / 1041 / 1638 / 12$ $63 / 2264 / 864 / 12$ |
|  |  | $67 / 1368 / 568 / 14$ |
| quantitation [1] 34/6quantities [1] $40 / 6$ | related [1] 23/4 | risk [2] 48/20 48/22 |
|  | 4] $23 / 23$ | risks [2] 16/3 16/7 |
| quantities [1] $40 / 6$quantity [1] $34 / 9$quarrel [1] $45 / 3$ |  | Rivers' [1] 51/14 |
|  | release [7] 46/24 48/23 51/1 57/16 | Rivad [1] 32/5 real |
| quarrel [1] 45/3 quarreling [1] 48/1 | 57/1757/19 58/8 | routinely [1] 35/1 |


| R | [1] 61/18 | sounded [1] 63/19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RPR [2] 1/22 69/19 | severity [2] 61/25 62/9 | eaking [1] 4/7 |
| Ruff [1] 20/23 | sexual [6] $7 / 2113 / 1213 / 2414 / 9$ | special [4] 1/14 2/9 2/14 43/10 |
| rule [11] 3/10 3/14 3/21 4/2 4/4 | 17/5 18/15 | (3) |
| 4/16 4/25 20/13 29/8 44/17 55/23 | shall [1] 42/11 | specifically [5] 7/1 25/24 40/22 |
| Rule 3.6[1] 4/16 | share [2] 51/22 64/ | 41/18 57/14 |
| ruled [4] 24/4 33/12 41/963/2 | Sheriff [1] 5/7 | specifics [1] 16/9 |
| rules [3] 6/11 11/17 26/13 | Sheriff's [1] 5/8 | spectrum [1] 29/21 |
| ruling [6] 11/12 17/16 64/7 64/24 | shifting [1] 15/23 | spoken [2] 28/11 68/12 |
| 65/367/14 | short [2] 23/25 68/9 | ss [1] 69/1 |
| run [3] 38/4 39/17 56/16 | shorthand [1] 69/10 | staff [1] 28/19 |
| runaway [1] 57/3 | should [11] 2/15 4/17 4/18 6/21 | stage [1] 61/12 |
| S | 28/16 28/20 40/15 52/23 61/22 | stand [3] 11/4 48/6 48/2 |
| sa | show [1] 28 | standards [2] 34/23 34 |
| said [2] 64/3 69/13 | showing [2] 12/25 58/1) | Stanton [1] 2/24 |
| Salvage [1] 46/13 | shut [1] $35 / 18$ | start [4] 9/7 13/7 62/19 65/25 |
| same [12] 19/19 22/1 22/16 28/15 | shutdown [1] 59/9 | Sarted [1] 12/20 |
| 38/5 42/5 42/6 42/17 42/18 52/16 | side [5] 6/13 52/12 52/12 53/7 | [88] |
| 58/1 64/15 | 55/3 | State's [15] 5/25 6/3 |
| sample [1] 39/12 | sides | 27/5 28/18 41/4 44/8 52/6 53/7 |
| satisfied [1] 64/23 | signed [1] 23/14 | 53/9 54/17 57/20 58/2 67/17 |
| say [9] 14/13 17/25 22/16 30/13 | significant [3] 60/6 61/14 63/25 | stated [1] 61/3 |
| 49/18 50/8 58/5 62/17 64/12 | signing [1] 64/3 | statement [15] |
| saying [2] 13/5 50/2 | similar [2] 14/20 29/10 | 14/4 14/17 17/7 19/2 19/13 19/21 |
| says [5] 15/19 19/16 38/12 42/25 | simply [9] 16/21 19/3 20/17 21/23 | 20/6 20/25 21/19 21/20 60/25 |
| 43/1 | 26/7 27/1 29/5 31/13 40/13 | 61/4 |
| scan [1] 35 | since [11] 6/8 9/6 50/8 51/2 52/ | statements [18] |
| scandal [1] 30/6 | 52/24 53/1 53/12 57/11 59/23 | 19/7 19/23 20/4 20/20 21/11 |
| scheduling [4] $23 / 1865 / 566 / 25$ | 64/6 | 21/13 21/17 21/24 22/4 22/17 |
| 67/3 | sit [5] 27/17 48/7 53/4 66/11 | 22/20 22/23 24/5 53/13 58/16 |
| scope [1] 5/9 | 66/22 | states [6] 20/3 22/15 28/12 29/17 |
| screened [2] 33/19 33/21 | sits [2] 47/13 47/18 | 29/18 30/19 |
| scrubs [1] 28/15 | sitting [2] 48/9 49/12 | stations [1] 6/19 |
| search [4] 27/11 37/19 50/13 | situation [3] 20/18 39/21 49/1 | status [1] 54/1 |
| 56/22 | six [3] 12/7 29/14 37/24 | statute [14] 41/16 42/21 42/25 |
| searched [1] | Sixth [1] 11/14 | 43/4 43/8 43/13 43/14 43/17 |
| searches [1] 56/21 | skipping [1] 48/12 | 44/17 53/6 55/8 55/21 58/1 62/25 |
| searching [1] 39/10 | slow [1] 16/5 | statutes [5] 26/1 41/15 46/3 57/14 |
|  | small [1] 37/21 | 60/15 |
| second [1] 52/13 | so [56] 3/8 6/24 10/3 11/9 13/7 | statutory [1] 32/21 |
| secondly [1] 39/17 | 13/20 16/15 18/1619/20 22/19 | stay [1] 49/20 |
| Section [3] 41/1842/8 42/20 | 23/1 23/5 26/1 27/21 28/20 29/1 | stenographic [1] 69/9 |
| Secure [4] $46 / 551 / 1852 / 252 / 21$ | 31/3 33/4 34/18 35/6 35/9 35/14 | step [1] 32/1 |
| security [7] 28/6 33/2 33/6 35/23 | 35/20 35/24 37/3 37/12 37/17 | Steve [8] 2/23 13/12 14/6 14/14 |
| 37/7 45/7 45/17 | 37/24 38/2 38/3 38/3 39/21 40/17 | 16/20 46/16 |
| see [9] 23/18 24/1 28/3 29/1 35/3 | 44/5 44/23 46/25 49/15 50/10 | STEVEN [6] 1/6 1/17 $2 / 216 / 22$ |
| 43/12 51/6 51/7 67/24 | 50/11 50/19 52/3 56/6 57/7 58/3 | 19/1753/11 |
| seeking [1] 56/4 | 58/4 63/2 63/13 64/8 65/10 66/6 | stick [1] 56/15 |
| seeks [1] 20/5 | 66/9 66/22 67/10 67/18 68/3 | still [3] 34/12 37/25 62/18 |
| seems [2] 43/14 44/17 | 68/13 | stopped [1] 55/13 |
| sees [1] 50/24 | solvent [1] 46/2 | stopping [1] 55/22 |
| seized [7] 10/12 24/21 27/10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { some }[27] 4 / 45 / 128 / 2214 / 20 \end{aligned}$ | STRANG[37] 1/15 2/22 2/24 4/1 |
| 37/16 37/1837/21 68/3 | 16/1 22/9 23/18 26/21 26/22 | 4/21 4/22 6/5 7/3 7/25 8/6 8/11 |
| send [1] 36/8 | 28/22 29/15 29/19 29/22 33/9 | 9/9 9/17 9/19 10/7 11/1 11/16 |
| senior [1] 51/23 | 33/23 38/19 43/10 43/16 47/11 | 11/19 12/12 18/21 19/6 19/8 23/8 |
| sensitive [3] 35/20 35/23 48/9 | 47/11 50/19 51/15 54/15 54/16 | 25/8 32/9 44/24 45/1 45/2 52/10 |
| sentence [1] 56/8 | 57/24 58/7 68/13 | 52/1753/3 55/17 55/23 56/2 |
| separate [3] 7/14 7/20 39/11 separately [1] 24/12 | somebody [1] 19/10 | 64/16 64/21 67/12 |
| separately [1] 24/12 <br> September [2] 66/9 66/17 | somehow [2] 27/25 29/3 | Strang's [3] 23/3 52/12 55/3 |
| September [2] 66/9 66/17 <br> September 5 [1] 66/17 | someone [6] 15/17 15/21 21/23 | strange [1] 58/5 |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { September } 5[1] \\ & \text { sequential }[1] \quad 66 / 17 / 17 \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22 / 235 / 1348 / 8 \\ & \text { something [16] } 5 / 14 \text { 10/2 } 18 / 1 \end{aligned}$ | streamed [1] strength [4] $53 / 9$ 53/10 60/1 |
| sequentially [1] 12/17 | $31 / 1933 / 2240 / 147 / 1447 / 16$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { strenc } \\ 60 / 21 \end{gathered}$ |
| Seraphim [1] 15/2 | 49/13 50/15 51/3 54/12 54/13 | strict [2] 34/22 34/24 |
| series [1] 7/23 | 56/12 63/25 65/11 | strictly [1] 23/23 |
| seriously [1] 37/13 | sometime [1] 63/20 | strike [1] 16/24 |
| set[12] 12/4 29/2 34/11 37/9 45/5 | somewhat [2] 25/5 61/19 | stringent [1] 34/22 |
| 46/1 51/2 51/19 55/15 58/20 65/9 | sorry [1] 32/11 | studies [1] 29/16 |
| 66/22 |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { sets [2] } 46 / 2454 / 15 \\ & \text { setting [2] } 60 / 1663 / 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48 / 9 \\ & \text { sound [3] } 15 / 25 \quad 38 / 2266 / 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { subject [1] } 43 / 3 \\ & \text { submit [1] } 33 / 22 \end{aligned}$ |

submitted [2] 42/2 42/14
subsequent [4] 17/18 27/4 39/12 40/16
substantial [1] 53/2
such [10] 5/6 21/13 21/25 22/4
34/24 35/14 41/3 41/9 41/14 63/2
sufficiency [7] 8/2 8/8 8/15 8/25
9/18 21/5 21/8
sufficient [9] $9 / 6$ 21/4 22/5 22/23
23/14 39/8 39/10 40/5 63/7
suggest [4] 18/11 43/14 57/3 63/4
suggested [1] 64/2
suggesting [3] 31/7 50/3 63/14
suggests [3] 26/19 27/3 49/18
summarize [1] 9/8
supply [1] 22/18
support [1] 17/8
suppose [2] 65/6 65/22
supposed [3] 28/8 49/20 49/21
Supreme [4] 3/10 4/24 15/12 20/3
sure [7] 9/2 9/4 15/2 30/13 30/18
56/23 65/3
sureties [1] 46/2
surety [2] 45/7 54/20
surgical [1] 28/15


## T

table [4] 2/24 6/12 7/2 13/8
tacitly [1] 50/3
take [17] 3/4 3/18 5/1 24/17 27/7
27/12 30/22 33/20 33/25 34/13
38/18 52/15 52/23 58/24 59/15
60/15 68/6
taken [4] 31/25 59/14 67/23 69/9
takes [3] 33/24 34/20 65/22
taking[2] 40/20 61/21
talk [3] 19/5 29/16 56/7
talked [1] 50/5
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { talking [5] } & 5 / 11 & 16 / 4 & 33 / 1437 / 17\end{array}$ 56/21
tape [1] 35/14
technically [1] 6/6
technicians [1] 25/17
telephone [2] 3/7 65/4
television [2] 6/18 56/18
tell [2] 50/23 63/15
Ten [1] 48/7
tendered [1] 57/6
tendering [1] 45/13
tenders [1] 16/16
Teresa [1] 10/19
terms [1] 56/17
Tesheneck [3] 1/22 69/4 69/19
test [10] 26/24 27/5 27/11 29/20
30/16 37/24 39/12 39/20 39/22
40/1 1
tested [3] 37/17 38/1 67/22
testify [2] 20/16 50/4
testimonial [1] 55/9
testimony [3] 20/8 20/14 22/11
testing [34] 24/18 24/23 25/12
25/15 25/18 26/21 26/21 27/21
29/2 30/1 31/12 32/17 33/1 33/23
34/4 36/8 37/5 39/4 40/6 40/23
40/24 41/3 41/12 43/2 44/8 44/12
44/15 66/6 66/15 67/6 67/15
67/17 67/18 68/1
tests [6] 26/3 26/11 27/4 27/8
29/22 44/1
than [13] 16/18 23/21 41/24 49/21
$52 / 354 / 1358 / 16$ 60/9 60/22
61/12 61/20 63/13 63/20
Thank[12] 7/9 9/10 12/11 19/25 $32 / 832 / 1437 / 952 / 958 / 2359 / 13$ 68/19 68/20

## Thanksgiving [1] 47/19

 that [435]that's [43] $4 / 8$ 8/16 8/18 8/24 14/14 15/21 16/21 17/2 19/12 19/25 22/7 22/13 22/24 23/14 $31 / 331 / 1432 / 733 / 833 / 23$ 36/15 38/15 38/16 38/24 39/5 39/19
39/19 41/5 43/22 46/22 52/4 55/6 $55 / 1255 / 2158 / 1361 / 364 / 13$ 64/19 65/2 65/7 67/6 67/19 68/2 68/13
their [15] $2 / 518 / 1119 / 2126 / 19$ 28/4 28/19 28/19 29/4 29/7 30/9 32/16 34/4 34/16 34/25 62/23
them [10] $26 / 14$ 26/16 32/22 37/21 37/22 49/6 49/17 59/1 59/24 66/9 then [19] $7 / 8$ 9/8 $18 / 3$ 19/5 $26 / 6$ 26/9 27/16 28/23 33/23 34/5 $34 / 1034 / 1236 / 1245 / 1452 / 15$ 56/9 59/1 64/24 65/4
there [50] 4/4 4/17 4/18 6/19 10/7 10/10 12/19 13/7 17/5 18/16 20/1 21/22 24/5 25/19 25/21 25/23 26/1 5 26/17 30/7 30/23 32/4 32/6 33/21 34/9 35/20 36/9 36/10 $37 / 1237 / 2037 / 2438 / 338 / 839 / 1$ 39/3 39/8 39/8 39/18 39/22 41/2 41/9 41/14 41/23 43/10 43/19 45/16 58/9 61/6 63/16 66/7 68/5 there's [14] 14/12 17/12 17/23 28/22 31/23 34/5 36/6 38/4 38/6 44/6 47/3 53/23 57/1 57/4
thereafter [1] 69/11
therefore [3] 31/7 44/18 54/19 therefrom [1] 9/16
these [14] 7/19 11/24 15/7 18/14 18/22 19/4 30/22 33/18 38/19 38/20 39/1 46/2 53/5 67/2 they [49] 3/17 4/1 4/8 $11 / 8$ 12/8 16/21 19/3 19/10 19/22 22/5 22/23 25/15 27/8 28/3 28/8 29/9 $33 / 433 / 1233 / 1933 / 2134 / 434 / 8$ $34 / 2135 / 135 / 235 / 335 / 1138 / 21$ 38/23 39/9 39/13 39/15 39/17 $44 / 13$ 45/20 49/8 49/8 49/18 50/8 50/8 56/23 62/6 62/24 62/24 62/25 65/14 66/7 66/9 67/24
thing [3] 6/13 38/11 43/24
things [10] $6 / 19$ 18/20 31/1 39/14
40/4 43/15 48/6 59/23 65/8 67/2
think [33] 4/15 4/23 5/10 11/15
15/8 20/17 23/3 25/5 25/6 25/10 25/25 26/17 27/10 31/10 32/3 $32 / 535 / 1537 / 2039 / 739 / 13$ $41 / 17$ 43/21 46/10 54/17 55/22 59/22 61/2 62/21 62/25 65/24 66/13 66/17 66/20
thinks [1] 5/15
this [109]
those [33] 5/1 8/4 10/21 10/22
11/13 11/14 11/1717/1118/6 18/11 20/18 22/11 22/22 24/8 25/17 26/13 28/9 30/19 30/20 36/9 36/16 36/21 38/4 44/5 45/24 49/5 52/16 53/21 53/23 54/11 61/21 62/7 67/10
though [3] 54/3 60/4 62/21
thought [2] 38/21 61/6
|threat [2] 19/17 29/3
three [13] 7/20 12/21 16/24 16/25
17/12 17/16 18/6 24/2 24/8 33/10 34/13 50/14 63/23
through [9] 6/17 12/17 20/6 30/1 30/5 35/12 38/9 39/18 58/17
throw [1] 11/20
tighten [1] 57/17
tighter [1] 57/24
time [31] $2 / 13 / 95 / 207 / 58 / 58 / 9$ 8/14 12/23 22/1 25/3 26/13 26/14 $31 / 2031 / 2333 / 638 / 543 / 2148 / 7$
$51 / 1152 / 25$ 53/1 55/15 59/5
59/10 59/12 59/19 61/6 61/8 63/7 63/8 64/15
timely [1] 66/8
times [2] 50/13 50/14
timetable [1] 67/11
timing [4] 8/1 8/22 17/2 67/5
title [1] 51/20
today [21] $3 / 37 / 313 / 2314 / 16$
43/9 44/20 45/4 47/13 47/18
49/18 52/4 59/25 62/13 62/20
63/3 63/13 64/5 64/11 66/25
68/10 68/18
today's [4] 13/2 23/17 40/20 59/7
together [4] 9/15 19/16 26/2 36/23
too [3] 9/23 15/20 49/11
torture [3] 50/5 50/15 50/16
toss [1] 13/25
total [1] 36/11
toward [1] 47/23
towards [1] 26/25
trailer [1] 50/17
transcribed [1] 69/11
transcript [4] 1/21 49/7 69/8 69/12
transcription [1] 69/11
transparency [3] 27/19 31/13
31/15
transparent [1] 25/12
trial [21] 3/12 11/3 11/6 11/13
11/15 11/18 11/24 11/24 14/18
$18 / 22$ 19/4 20/5 22/13 42/5 42/17
54/2 55/11 55/19 66/9 66/17 67/3
tried [1] 61/7
tries [1] 57/3
trouble [1] 51/24
true [4] 31/3 39/1 68/2 69/12
truth [1] 27/1
truthful [2] 15/8 16/19
try [4] 3/16 38/18 39/20 56/16
trying [4] 21/23 35/13 48/11 49/9
turns [1] 28/22
TV [1] 30/25
two [6] $7 / 1313 / 18$ 16/6 30/11 34/1351/14
type [3] 28/15 33/23 43/24
types [2] 29/10 40/10
typing [1] 35/12
U
U.S [1] 15/12
ugly [2] 14/12 49/16
ultimate [1] 31/2
ultimately [1] 10/18
unable [1] 11/8
uncle [1] 19/17
under[11] 3/10 3/21 11/18 22/14 26/4 26/11 36/21 43/11 57/13 60/5 62/25
understand [14] 5/14 6/9 7/25
24/23 32/10 33/13 37/14 38/2
38/8 41/13 41/22 48/2 48/10
understand... [1] 66/21
understanding [7] 3/11 4/7 5/3
5/12 8/12 37/1 64/19
understands [1] 9/25
understood [1] 64/6
unequivocal [1] 61/4
unincumbered [1] 45/24
unique [2] 11/15 25/6
United [2] 20/3 22/14
unless [3] 8/5 45/15 47/8
unnamed [1] 36/1
unnecessary [1] 18/6
unrelated [4] 7/23 12/9 18/12 18/14
unreliability [2] 12/15 17/4
unreliable [4] 15/22 16/13 16/14 17/7
until [3] 8/6 39/13 60/11
unusual [2] 25/5 26/17
up [23] 3/4 3/18 6/20 6/21 24/17
26/12 28/21 28/21 29/2 30/16
$34 / 11$ 37/9 39/4 40/1 40/20 47/14
56/22 56/24 57/2 57/17 65/9 67/23 68/6
upon [7] 7/17 12/6 21/11 32/15
36/24 37/7 42/9
us [3] 66/16 67/20 67/23
use [2] 14/8 46/4
used [12] 20/14 20/20 21/18 22/4
22/16 22/18 22/21 39/4 42/6
42/18 53/22 62/4
usefully [1] 13/23
using [1] $45 / 16$
utmost [1] 33/3
V
value [8] 33/22 45/23 45/24 46/12
46/15 46/16 47/4 47/6
variety [1] 14/25
various [1] 28/12
versus [1] 20/23
very [27] 3/1 4/15 15/16 15/24
$\begin{array}{llllll}16 / 12 & 18 / 1 & 18 / 5 & 18 / 25 & 26 / 17 & 28 / 9\end{array}$
28/14 30/14 33/4 34/6 34/22
35/23 35/23 37/21 38/16 38/22
46/11 49/18 49/18 51/11 54/17
66/17 66/20
video [2] 7/1 35/13
videotape [3] 25/1731/20 37/5
videotaped [3] 24/23 32/18 40/25
videotaping [2] 32/23 35/17
view [3] 27/20 40/15 59/24
viewing [1] 36/25
violated [2] $45 / 15$ 57/16
violation [3] 57/18 57/23 58/7
violations [1] 12/4
violence [3] 53/22 54/16 60/8
virtually [1] 20/15
visited [1] 53/12
voluntarily [1] 19/18
W
wading [1] 46/25
wait [2] 8/6 64/6
walk [1] 12/16
want [9] 24/2 24/8 40/3 51/19
51/20 65/12 66/11 66/21 66/22
wanted [4] 50/22 55/1 57/9 57/17
wants [5] 8/5 51/13 55/17 56/7
56/22
warning [1] 66/12
warrant [4] $26 / 1827 / 1137 / 19$
warranted [1] 54/7
warrants [1] 50/14
was [37] 6/15 10/4 10/12 11/2
12/19 13/10 15/3 15/19 15/20
15/20 21/3 27/11 29/8 30/2 30/3
31/9 35/8 35/9 41/1 41/2 41/8
41/9 42/21 43/25 49/4 49/7 49/9
49/14 53/1 54/1 57/11 58/14 60/9
61/8 61/18 63/16 64/3
Waukesha [1] 65/20
way [9] 15/24 27/4 28/7 28/15
29/1 31/2 31/11 63/9 65/4
ways [1] 45/16
we [58] 3/4 4/14 5/6 5/11 6/14 6/16 8/11 $11 / 912 / 913 / 1$ 16/8
17/3 17/13 17/20 19/12 23/18 23/25 24/14 29/12 30/14 30/21
30/21 31/10 31/10 32/7 39/21
40/3 40/15 41/16 45/3 45/22
46/23 47/14 49/23 51/2 51/4 51/7
52/11 52/24 52/25 53/12 56/9
57/7 57/20 59/3 62/13 63/2 65/4
65/23 65/24 66/24 67/7 67/7
67/10 67/19 67/21 68/8 68/9
we'll [3] 27/15 67/19 67/24
we're [15] 2/3 6/8 15/13 16/4 31/7
$31 / 1433 / 1437 / 1745 / 1149 / 24$
50/1 59/5 62/15 63/1 68/17
web [1] 6/10
week [1] 3/8
weeks [1] $34 / 13$
welcome [1] 25/11
well [11] $2 / 23$ 2/25 3/1 9/21 10/19 11/4 11/22 45/24 47/6 49/1 50/22
went [2] 30/5 30/11
were [23] $3 / 178 / 2318 / 218 / 12$
19/24 $21 / 1425 / 827 / 1028 / 230 / 7$ $35 / 15$ 35/16 36/2 36/3 37/21
38/22 49/5 49/8 49/8 57/15 57/19 58/5 61/9
what [34] $7 / 3$ 14/2 $17 / 17$ 19/12
27/20 29/12 29/13 30/23 31/7 $31 / 831 / 932 / 733 / 1334 / 3$ 36/2 $36 / 3$ 36/12 36/13 37/14 42/25 45/11 46/12 47/4 48/4 52/24
53/13 54/8 55/2 55/19 60/12 63/9 64/3 65/16 67/1
what's [5] 29/6 34/5 50/20 67/19 67/22
whatever [4] 6/10 39/11 39/16 50/8
when [27] $12 / 1$ 15/17 $16 / 4$ 17/10
19/1 19/20 19/20 22/5 24/19
26/13 31/21 31/23 31/25 32/1 $33 / 1833 / 2334 / 1737 / 2239 / 2$
48/10 49/19 49/21 53/5 53/7
58/11 63/15 68/8
whenever [1] 13/10
where [21] 16/21 20/5 20/18 21/19
21/22 21/24 22/4 22/11 25/15
25/15 29/8 33/10 36/6 36/9 36/15
$36 / 16$ 36/22 38/20 39/21 49/12
56/25
whereby [1] 28/19
whether [14] 20/19 20/24 23/10
$34 / 935 / 938 / 2539 / 539 / 1639 / 18$ 41/1 43/9 49/19 49/20 56/15
which [37] 3/22 5/14 6/20 7/2 7/12 9/1 9/2 9/13 10/13 10/23 13/18 16/11 $17 / 19$ 17/23 20/12 20/23 21/10 22/25 24/1 24/18 26/7

26/1 1 28/6 34/7 34/10 38/7 38/11
40/13 41/6 43/11 48/17 48/18
49/13 58/9 63/23 64/10 64/13
while [6] $13 / 21 \quad 15 / 13$ 27/13 49/4
53/25 60/10
who [10] 6/24 16/5 28/10 28/11
45/19 48/9 49/3 50/2 51/25 56/22
whole [1] $37 / 8$
wholly [5] $7 / 23$ 12/9 18/12 $18 / 14$
51/21
why [7] 9/8 $18 / 1138 / 1655 / 13$
55/21 56/6 66/21
wife [3] 49/3 49/9 49/23
will [47] $2 / 53 / 13 / 64 / 105 / 20$
5/22 5/23 6/20 7/7 8/4 9/6 9/9
12/2 12/9 18/1 18/16 21/2 23/6
23/8 23/16 23/19 24/1 24/6 24/17
24/24 25/2 30/13 36/5 36/10
37/23 37/25 39/3 43/19 44/23
44/24 48/5 49/19 49/20 50/4 51/7
52/13 53/11 59/24 60/13 62/5
62/12 63/14
Williams [1] 2/20
Williamson [1] 15/14
willing [4] 28/25 45/20 64/25
68/10
Willis [1] $1 / 11$
Willy [1] 21/13
WISCONSIN [20] $1 / 1$ 1/3 $1 / 14$ 2/2
2/7 14/25 16/10 17/18 20/22 22/3
30/14 35/1 35/22 41/15 42/22
42/23 46/3 54/15 69/1 69/6
wish [2] 23/9 62/24
wishes [4] 9/3 13/25 23/5 68/6
withdraw [1] 63/8
withheld [1] $8 / 22$
within [11] 5/9 9/14 9/23 10/1
10/21 10/24 14/24 23/13 58/14 64/2 64/9
without [8] 11/7 11/10 13/10 16/6
19/17 19/17 35/10 46/25
withstand [1] 18/3
witness [1] 14/20
witnesses [5] 42/4 42/16 55/13
55/18 62/22
won't [1] 63/3
wonder [1] 6/10
wondered [1] 6/7
wonders [1] 56/6
word [1] 6/10
wording [1] 15/9
words [1] 46/3
work [4] 3/16 26/21 52/1 65/24
working [2] 38/7 45/5
works [1] 27/17
world [2] 30/5 45/21
worldwide [1] 30/23
worried [1] 65/8
worth [1] 65/16
worthwhile [2] 37/23 59/22
worthy [2] 5/15 39/9
would [81]
wouldn't [4] 31/19 31/24 51/9 57/9
writing [2] 34/23 40/2
writs [1] 55/18
written [10] 8/7 9/20 9/20 27/24
28/4 29/7 49/5 64/6 64/23 65/1
wrong [1] 32/5
wrongfully [1] 44/3
wrongly [1] 30/1
wrote [2] 49/3 49/16


